This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

HD WIDENER
HW T7BJ T

330.36.30

SIGILL: COLL: HARVARD: CANTAB: NOV: ANGL: 1650.
CHRISTO ET ECCLESIAE
The Gift of
Thomas M. Preble,
the Author,
of North Cambridge,
20 Dec. 1872.

THE

FIRST-DAY SABBATH:

CLEARLY PROVED

BY SHOWING THAT THE OLD COVENANT, OR TEN COMMANDMENTS, HAVE BEEN CHANGED, OR MADE COMPLETE, IN THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

IN

TWO PARTS.

BY

T. M. PREBLE,

AUTHOR OF "TWO HUNDRED STORIES FOR CHILDREN," "THREE KINGDOMS," "TWO ADAMS," &C.

"The Sabbath was made for man."—JESUS.

BUCHANAN, MICHIGAN:

PUBLISHED BY THE W. A. C. P. ASSOCIATION.

1867.

44,36
C 1330.36.30
√

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

1872, Dec. 20.
Gift of
Thos. M. Preble,
of North Cambridge.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1867, by

THOMAS M. PREBLE,

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

PREFACE.

HAVING spent most of my time for the last three years in reviewing the whole matter relating to the Sabbath question, I now present the result of my labors to the public. In the following pages will be found a Scriptural and Historical argument in favor of the first-day Sabbath.

The course pursued is briefly this:

I. It is shown that the old Jewish law, or ten commandments, is "done away," not in the sense of complete abrogation without a substitute in the Christian dispensation; but we endorse the view presented by Justin Martyr (Dialogue with Trypho, p. 41), which is as follows:

"For that law which was promulged from Horeb is now waxen old, and was peculiar to you only; but this new covenant extends to the whole race of mankind. And as a subsequent law repeals that which was made before it, in like manner does the new covenant disannul the old. But a new and everlasting law is given to us, viz: Christ and a faithful covenant; after which no other law, precept, or command shall be given."

Although the *seventh-day* Sabbath is abrogated, yet the *first-day* Sabbath is binding. Says Christ: "*The Sabbath was made for man.*" Sabbath signifies "*rest:*" and as an *institution*, was made for man—*all mankind:* but the Sabbath as an institution, and the *day of the week* on which it is holden, are two distinct things.

II. By the types of the Old Testament, and by the practice and precepts of the apostles, we show that the *day has been changed* from the seventh to the first day of the week.

III. We also show that the early Christians and the Waldenses kept the first day of the week.

IV. The second part of this work contains a review of Uriah Smith, and J. N. Andrews, recent seventh-day writers, in which is shown that they have perverted the Scriptures, and also Ecclesiastical History, in support of their views of the Sabbath.

That the reader may be profited by the perusal of the following pages, overlooking the imperfections of the writer, and we at last be permitted to enjoy that Sabbath which remains "to the people of God," is the sincere prayer of the Author.

T. M. P.

TO THE READER.

I. *Seven questions.*

1. Is there a passage in all the Bible to prove that the seventh day of the *week* is to be observed as the Sabbath? If so, where is it to be found? Understand us: The question is not whether the "seventh day" following "six days shalt thou labor" is to be observed; but the seventh day of the WEEK.

2. Is there a place in all the Bible but what shows clearly that the seventh day to be observed as the Sabbath, was always the seventh day following *six days shalt thou labor*—the day of the *week* not particularly specified? If such a passage is to be found, where is it?

3. Is there a passage in the Bible to prove that the LORD ever sanctified but *one* seventh day of the WEEK? and that, the day on which "he rested?" If such a passage is to be found, where is it?

4. Is it not always the case that it is the *Sabbath* which was sanctified; the particular day of the *week* not specified? If this is not the case, point to chapter and verse which disproves it.

5. Does Christ ever say that the seventh day of the week "was made for man?" If so, where?

6. If, then, it is the *Sabbath* that *was made for man*, and not the seventh *day of the week*, are not Christians observing the Sabbath when they *rest* on the first day of the week, it being really "*the seventh day*" following *six days of labor?*

7. If the *Sabbath* was made for *man*—all mankind—how can

it be true that *all mankind* could keep the particular seventh day of the *week*, on which the *Lord rested?*

II. *The term Sabbath.*

THE time was when to call the *first* day of the week the *Sabbath* would lead to confusion; as it was not an easy thing, or the work of a few years, to establish the change from the old Jewish *seventh* day, to that of the Christian *first* day, for the Sabbath. A distinction must be made in the *names* by which these two days were called, so that all classes, in different parts of the world, could readily understand *which* day was intended. To drop the *name* of Sabbath, for the seventh day, all at once, *could not be done:* neither could both days be called Sabbath without confusion. Hence, the change of names. This fact has been overlooked.

By the following historical facts, we think it will be readily seen that, in our times, the first day of the week had better be called the *Sabbath*, instead of calling it by the name Sunday, or Lord's day. On a little reflection, it will be readily seen that, in order to keep up the distinction between *Jewish* and *Christian* customs, it would be absolutely necessary for a long time to call the seventh day by its old familiar name—Sabbath. It would be impossible to do otherwise without confusion. The first and the seventh days must be called by such names as would make a proper distinction between them, until the *first-day Sabbath* was fully established in the Christian Church.

We, therefore, find it stated by Dr. Heylyn, in his *History of the Sabbath* (London, 1681), p. 422:

"That the *Saturday* is called amongst them by no other name than that which formerly it had, the *Sabbath*. So that whenever, for a thousand years and upwards, we meet with *Sabbatum*, in any writer, of what name soever, it must be understood of no day but *Saturday*. As for the other day, the day of the resurrection, all the Evangelists, and St. Paul, take notice of no other name than of the first day of the week (or *Sabbaton*). St. John, and after him Ignatius, call it the Lord's day. But then again, Justin Martyr for the second century doth in two several passa-

ges call it no otherwise than *Sunday*, as then the Gentiles called it, and we call it now: and so Tertullian for the third, who useth both, and calls it sometimes *diem solis*, and sometimes *Dominicum*, as before we said. Which questionless neither of them would have done, on what respect soever, had it been either contrary to the Word of God, or scandalous unto his Church."

Now, if we pass to still later times than Heylyn speaks of as above, we shall find that Morer (p. 189) quotes Scaliger as saying:

"They call both days by the name of Sabbath, the *first* and the *latter Sabbath;* or in their language, the one Sanbath Sachristos, *Christ's Sabbath;* the other Sanbath Judi, the *Jew's Sabbath.*"

The following important historical facts are from Coleman's *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, p. 527:

"*The observance of the Lord's day as the first day of the week was at first introduced as a separate institution.* Both this and the Jewish Sabbath were kept for some time; then the Christian began to take precedence of the Jewish Sabbath; finally, the latter passed wholly over into the former, which now took the place of the ancient Sabbath of the Israelites. But their Sabbath, the last day of the week, was strictly kept in connection with that of the first day for a long time after the overthrow of the temple and its worship. Down even to the fifth century the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian Church; but with a rigor and solemnity gradually diminishing until it was WHOLLY DISCONTINUED."

The following is from the celebrated work of James Gilfillan, of Scotland, p. 307:

"The subsequent history of the seventh-day Sabbath, while it illustrates the wisdom of this policy, confirms our doctrine of its authoritative abolition. Regard for it died out, and another day rose gradually and peacefully to ascendancy. For a time the former continued as a *subordinate* season of worship, but for some fifteen or sixteen centuries it has been, *except by the Jews* and a *very small sect* of Christians, ALTOGETHER DISREGARDED."

Again, on pp. 368–9, he says:

"The history of the earlier centuries of Christianity throws light on the meaning of certain Scripture terms which have been the occasion of a vexed question among controversialists. In

designating what is now known amongst us as the Christian Sabbath, the *Fathers* make use of names which *they* never apply to any other day of the week. With them 'the eighth day,' 'the day of the Sun,' 'the first day of the week,' and 'the Lord's day,' signify one particular day and no other. Barnabas, or whoever was the author of the Catholic epistle ascribed to him, mentions 'the eighth day' as that on which 'Jesus rose from the dead,' and which the Christians of his time observed as a festal day.* We are informed by Justin Martyr that the Christians of the second century assembled on 'the day of the Sun,' and that they did so 'because on this first day God made the world, and Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead.'† The same Father affirms that 'Christ rose from the dead on the eighth day, which,' he adds, 'may be called the eighth and yet remains the first.'‡ In the third century, Cyprian represents the eighth day as both 'the first after the Sabbath, and the Lord's day.'‖

"When we compare these passages with each other, we find that 'the eighth day,' 'the day of the Sun,' or Sunday, 'the day of the Redeemer's resurrection,' 'the first day of the week,' and 'the Lord's day,' are, according to the combined testimony of Barnabas, Justin Martyr, and Cyprian, the same day. * * * As 'the Sabbath' had been for so long a time the well-known title of the weekly holy day among the Jews, it was obviously needful, for preventing mistake, that the *institution* which had passed to a *new day* should have a *new name*. But as time advanced, and (may not we add) as the Lord's day came to be no longer in danger of being confounded with the Jewish Sabbath, the old name was gradually resumed and attached to the Christian holy day."

* *Epistle*, c. 15.
† *Apol.* 1. *ad finem.*
‡ *Dial cum. Tryph.*, c. 41.
‖ *Epistle* 64.

THE FIRST-DAY SABBATH

CHAPTER I.

IS THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH STILL BINDING?

I ONCE observed the seventh-day Sabbath for about three years—from 1844 to 1847; when, becoming convinced that I was wrong, I gave it up, and returned to the observance of the "*first day*" again. As I wrote and published upon this subject, and a few of my "tracts" are yet in being, some are making what use they can of them to advance the cause of the seventh day. Wishing to atone in part, or as far as I am able, for the evils I may have done in publishing so far as I did this error; and especially as many have solicited my reasons for the change of my views, and what Scriptural grounds I have for my present position, I deem it my duty now to defend the truth.

For any one to establish a system based upon the Old Testament Scriptures, and then try to make the

New Testament *conform* to it, is putting a "yoke" upon their own "necks," and upon the necks of others who are made to believe them, *"which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear."* And as the apostle says to the Corinthians:

"But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which veil is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their hearts. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away." (2 Cor. 3: 14–16.)

And I will repeat that, at "this day," many "minds are blinded," because "the same veil" remains "untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament;" and it is a great pity that men will not turn their "hearts" to the LORD JESUS; then "the veil shall be taken away," and thus be no longer "upon their hearts." But if men are determined to go it "blind," the "ditch" must take them up.

It will be safe for us to take the apostle Paul's advice found in Romans 14: 5, 6:

"One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it."

If any one believes otherwise, let him be "fully persuaded in his own mind;" and I, for myself, intend to be fully persuaded, or *assured*, as the margin reads, in my own mind. So, if any one thinks he

ought to observe the seventh day for the Sabbath, I do not wish to have useless contention with him about it; for if he can regard the day "unto the Lord," let him do so. I carried that "yoke" as long as I could regard the day unto the Lord. If others wish to esteem the seventh day above another, let *them* try it until *they* are satisfied, as I have been. I now regard the "first day" "unto the Lord."

The seventh-day Sabbath was a "sign" unto the "children of Israel." Proof:

"Speak thou also unto the *children of Israel*, saying, Verily *my Sabbaths* ye shall keep: for *it* is a *sign* between *me* and *you* throughout *your* generations; that *ye* may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. *Ye* shall keep *the Sabbath* therefore; for *it is* holy unto *you*. Every one that defileth *it* shall *surely* be put to *death:* for whosoever doeth *any work* therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. *Six days* may work be done; but in *the seventh is the Sabbath* of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth *any* work in *the Sabbath-day*, he shall *surely* be put to *death*. Wherefore the *children* of *Israel* shall keep *the Sabbath*, to observe *the Sabbath* throughout *their generations for* a perpetual covenant. *It is* a *sign* between *me* and the children of *Israel* forever: for in *six days* the Lord made heaven and earth, and on *the seventh day* he rested, and was refreshed." (Ex. 31: 13–17.)

For the sake of brevity, and for emphasis, I have taken the liberty to *italicize* a few words in my quotations from the Scriptures. I shall be pardoned in this, I trust. But still more *proof:*

"Wherefore I caused *them* to go forth out of the land of *Egypt*, and brought *them* into the *wilderness*. And I gave *them* my

statutes, and showed *them* my judgments, which *if* a [illegible], he shall even live in them. Moreover *also* I gave *them my Sabbaths*, to be a *sign* between *me* and *them*, that *they* might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." (Ezk. 20: 10–12.)

The passage just quoted from Exodus 31 proves positively that the Sabbath referred to is "the seventh-day" Sabbath, "the Sabbath of rest," the one called "holy to the Lord:" and yet the LORD JEHOVAH says "IT is a SIGN" between him and "*the children of Israel.*" How long? "*Throughout their generations.*" How long did the generations of the children of Israel continue? See Matthew 1: 1, 17:

"The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the carryimg away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations."

Let any one find the generations of the "children of Israel" to continue, as recognized by the Scriptures any longer than until Christ, if they can.

OF WHAT WAS THE SABBATH A SIGN OR TYPE?

It was a type of the seventh millennium, or "thousand years." Then says the objector, How can you make it out that the *type will cease* to be observed until the *antitype is reached?* I answer, the same as other types ceased to be observed, before the antitypes were reached: as for example, look at the "high priest" who went "into the holy place" once every year:

"The Holy Ghost *this signifying*, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a *figure* for the time *then present*, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on *them until the time of reformation*. But Christ being come a *high priest* of good things *to come*, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building: neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, *having obtained* eternal redemption *for us*." (Heb. 9: 8–12.)

This says: "*Having obtained eternal redemption for us*." But we have not really obtained this redemption yet; neither can we, until Christ comes "*the second time without sin unto salvation*."

"For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures* of the true; but into *heaven itself, now* to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but *now once* in the end of the world hath he *appeared* to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: *so Christ* was *once offered* to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the *second time* without sin unto salvation." (Heb. 9: 24–28.)

Thus we see that the Levitical priesthood was a type of the priesthood of Christ: but the Levitical priesthood has been "changed," and, hence, the type

has *ceased* to be observed; as we read in Hebrews 7: 11, 12:

"If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the *priesthood being changed*, there is made of necessity a *change also of the law*."

But let us examine this still more, and see how clearly we can establish the fact, that the priesthood of Christ is the antitype of the Levitical priesthood; and although the type has *ceased* to be observed, yet the antitype is *not yet reached* in its completion:

"For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood. And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." (Heb. 7: 13–16.)

Mark this last expression: Our "priest" is made "not after the *law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of* AN ENDLESS LIFE." But again:

"By so much was Jesus made a *surety* of a better testament. And they truly were many priests, because *they* were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but *this man*, because he continueth ever, hath an *unchangeable priesthood*." (Heb. 7: 22–24.)

Yes, "*by so much was Jesus made a* SURETY *of a better testament*." (v. 22.)

And so it is with the Sabbath: it was a sign or type of that "rest"—or "keeping of a Sabbath" (margin)—which "remaineth" "to the people of God." And as Christ does not fulfill the type of the priesthood until he comes out of the holy of holies, or out of "heaven itself," to give "the people of God" "*an endless* life;" so the type of the Sabbath will not be fulfilled until Christ comes out of "heaven itself" to give "the people of God" that "rest" which "remaineth" for them. Hence the apostle says:

"Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: *We* have such a *high priest* who is set on the *right hand of the throne* of the *Majesty* in the *heavens;* a minister of the sanctuary, and of the *true tabernacle,* which the Lord pitched and not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the *example* and *shadow* of *heavenly things,* as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the *pattern* showed to thee in the mount. But now hath he obtained a *more excellent ministry,* by how much also he is the *mediator* of a *better covenant,* which was established upon *better promises.*" (Heb. 8: 1–6.)

So Adam was a *type* [*tupos*] of Christ (Rom. 5: 14); yet the type ceased before the antitype was reached.

Can there be a *law* without a *penalty?* Surely not. The following will illustrate our view of the abrogation of the Jewish law as given in the Deca-

logue. Suppose a State at one time should pass a law against ten particular crimes, or acts, the *penalty*, for a violation of each, being *death* by hanging. But in process of time the government should so far change the law as to make the penalty *imprisonment* for life. Would not the *first* law be repealed? And still there would be *a* law against the *same ten crimes;* but the old law would be *dead*, because its penalty had been changed. So with the Decalogue; the penalty for a violation of each of the ten commandments was *death:* but that law has been repealed, or abrogated, because the penalty has been changed from "*death*," inflicted by the civil arm, to, "They which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal. 5: 21.) Both the old and the new codes of the "ten commandments" have been written in "*tables:*" the first "in tables of stone," the second "in fleshly tables of the heart;" not with "*ink*," but "*with the Spirit of the living God.*" (2 Cor. 3: 3.) Hence, the old law written on tables of *stone* is "done away," and the law written in fleshly tables of the heart is the one by which Christians should be governed. See Hebrews 8: 10; 10: 16:

"Six days may work be done; but in the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath-day, he shall *surely be put to death.*" (Ex. 31: 15.)

And again:

"Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day there shall be to you a holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord:

whosoever doeth work therein *shall be put to death.* Ye shall kindle *no fire* throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath-day." (Ex. 35: 2, 3.)

Is this penalty now in force? No one dare say it is. If they do, then let *them go without* "FIRE" on the Sabbath! If, then, the *penalty* is "done away," or abrogated, then the *law* is also "done away," which required THE *penalty.* But those who contend for observing the Sabbath according to "the letter" of the law advocate "*death,*" even until now. If they ask why, I answer, "*The letter killeth.*" Shall we advocate "life?" or "*death?*" Life, certainly, says the advocate for the seventh-day Sabbath. Then be consistent, and yield to the "able ministers of the New Testament," and follow the *spirit,* and not the *letter;* "for the letter *killeth,* but the spirit giveth *life;*" as the apostle says:

"God" "hath made us *able ministers* of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the *letter killeth,* but the *spirit giveth life.* But if the ministration of death, *written and engraven in stone,* was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is *done away* was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious." (2 Cor. 3: 6–11.)

What distraction and "*division*" those are guilty of,

who "preach another gospel," as those certainly do who advocate following the "letter" as "written and engraven on stones;" instead of advocating following the "spirit." "For if that which *is done away* was glorious, much more that which *remaineth is glorious.* Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech" (2 Cor. 3: 11, 12); and say with the apostle:

"But there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1: 7, 9.)

And why will not men take heed, and follow the "*spirit*" instead of the "*letter?*" For if any one follow the "letter," he will surely "*be* ACCURSED," for the "LETTER KILLETH!" And the apostle would even denounce "an angel from heaven" with a *curse,* if he should "preach another gospel!" From what source did the apostle Paul receive the gospel he preached? Not from the "ten commandments," "*but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" (Gal. 1: 12.) My "great plainness of speech" must be continued so as to say: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences *contrary* to the *doctrine* which ye have learned; and avoid them." (Rom. 16: 17.)

Did the apostle ever advocate the "doctrine" of "the seventh-day Sabbath?" Never. Then those

who do advocate it, do so *"contrary to the doctrine"* which the apostle preached; and therefore, if man, or "an angel from heaven," "cause divisions" contrary to the apostle's "doctrine," they are to "be accursed!" Thus saith the Scriptures.

Are Christians, under the gospel dispensation, required to *go back* to the law by which "the commonwealth of Israel" were once to be governed? Or are they to step *forward;* and thus, by reason of Christ, who *"is our peace,"* be "made both one?" Or, in other words, was "the middle wall of partition" "broken down" that the Gentiles might *go back* where the Jews *had been?* or were the Jews to stand with the Gentiles? Let Paul answer:

"Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from *the commonwealth of Israel*, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: but *now*, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is *our peace*, who hath made *both one*, and hath *broken down the middle wall* of partition between us; having *abolished* in his flesh the enmity, even the *law of commandments* contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so *making peace;* and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: and came and *preached peace* to *you* which were *afar off*, and to *them* that *were* nigh. For through him *we both* have access by *one Spirit* unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but *fellow-citizens* with the *saints*, and of the household of God; and are built upon the

foundation of the *apostles* and *prophets*, *Jesus Christ* himself being the *chief corner-stone;* in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord: in whom *ye also are builded together* for an habitation of God *through the Spirit.*" (Eph. 2: 11–22.)

Yes! "*we are builded together for an habitation of God* THROUGH THE SPIRIT" (v. 22), and not through the "*letter*," or "the law." For the "law worketh *wrath*," or "death;" but the "*Spirit*" worketh "*peace*," or "life." And thus we greatly rejoice, that Christ Jesus hath "*abolished* in his flesh the enmity, *even the law* of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of *twain one new man*, SO MAKING PEACE." (Eph. 2: 15.)

We will now turn our attention to what is called "the moral law."

Christ affirms that "*the great commandment in the law*" is this, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart. * * * And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Matt. 22: 36–39.) Now here are two "*commandments in the law*," and all admit they are *now* ingredients of the "*law of Christ;*" but they *never* belonged to the *Decalogue*. Consequently, if "*all the law and the prophets*" hang on "*these two commandments*," it is demonstrated that the old law of the Decalogue IS DONE AWAY; as the *law* of *Christ* rests on laws that were *outside of the* Decalogue. See Deuteronomy 6: 5; Leviticus 19: 18.

But says the objector, Is there no law now in force

which relates to the moral and social duties of man with man, and also our duty to God? Certainly, there is THE MORAL LAW OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; but that of the Old as given to Moses is "done away," as will more clearly appear as we proceed. In Romans 3: 20–22 we read:

"Therefore by the *deeds* of the *law* there shall *no flesh* be *justified* in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But *now* the righteousness of God *without the law* is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is *by faith* of Jesus Christ unto *all* and upon *all* them that *believe;* for there is *no difference.*"

What law is this here spoken of by the apostle? Not the *ceremonial* or *ritual,* but the *moral law* of the Old Testament. Then let us start fairly, and always bear in mind that "*by the deeds*" or works "*of the law* there shall no" person living be justified in God's sight. We then inquire with the apostle: "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by THE *law of faith.* Therefore we conclude that a man is justified *by faith* WITHOUT the deeds of the *law.* Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision *by* faith, and the uncircumcision *through* faith. Do we then *make void* the law through faith? *God forbid:* yea, we *establish* the law." (Rom. 3: 27–31.)

But let us remember, that we do not "establish the law" by keeping the old law of works, but by the *new*

"law of FAITH." If we observe the old law of works, "faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." "For the promise, that he should be the *heir* of the *world*, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, *through* the *law*, but through the *righteousness* of *faith*. For *if* they which are of the *law* be *heirs*, *faith* is made *void*, and the *promise* made of none effect: because the *law* worketh *wrath:* for where no law is, there is no transgression. Therefore it is of *faith*, that it might be by *grace;* to the end the promise might be *sure to all the seed;* not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all." (Rom. 4: 13–16.) Thus we see, that the promise made to Abraham that he should be "*the heir of the* WORLD" [*kosmos*—habitable globe], was not through the works of the law; "but through the righteousness of faith." "Therefore, it is of *faith*, that it might be by *grace;* to the end the *promise might be sure* to all the seed."

What saith the Scripture?

"Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that *worketh* is the reward *not reckoned* of *grace*, but of *debt*. But to him that *worketh not*, but *believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly, *his faith* is counted for righteousness." (Rom. 4: 3–5.) "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for *ye* are *not under the law*, but *under grace*. What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." (Rom. 6: 14, 15.) "For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not

imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. * * * Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, *grace did much more abound:* that as sin hath reigned unto death, even *so* might *grace reign through righteousness* unto *eternal life* BY JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD." (Rom. 5: 13, 14, 20, 21.) "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also *are become dead* to the *law* BY the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him that is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we *were* in the flesh, the motions of sins, which *were* by the *law*, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto *death*. But NOW WE ARE DELIVERED FROM THE LAW, *that being dead* wherein we *were* held; that we should serve in *newness* of *spirit*, and not in the *oldness of the letter*." (Rom. 7: 4–6.)

Here we reach a point of much interest. Two things in this last quotation require special attention. And *first*, we *prove positively* that the *law* here spoken of is not the ceremonial, but the "*moral law;*" for we see by referring to v. 3 of this same chapter, that the *law* referred to is that which speaks of "*adultery*," and this sin is the one mentioned in the "seventh commandment" of the Decalogue; and this is what gives us the positive proof that the "*moral law*" is the one referred to. And *second*, we also *prove positively*, that *this* moral law *is* DEAD, as we find in v. 6 of the last quotation: "But *now* we are *delivered from the law*, THAT BEING DEAD wherein we *were held;* that we should serve in NEWNESS OF SPIRIT, and *not* in the *oldness* of the LETTER."

"There is therefore *now* no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For *the law of the Spirit of life* in Christ Jesus *hath made me free from the law of sin* and *death*. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the *righteousness* of the *law* might be *fulfilled in us*, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (Rom. 8: 1–4.) "What shall we say then? that the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith; but Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? *Because they sought it not by faith*, but as it were by the works of the law: for they stumbled at that stumbling-stone." (Rom. 9: 30–32.)

Yes, "they stumbled at that stumbling-stone!" Would to God the *stumbling* had all been confined to the old Jews! But, alas! too many are *still stumbling in the same way*, and for the same cause! They love the old law of works better that the *new "law of faith!"* And it appears to me that the language of the apostle to the Hebrews will most strikingly apply to such. Says Paul:

"He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath *trodden under foot the Son of God*, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and *hath done despite* unto the *Spirit of grace?*" (Heb. 10: 28, 29.)

But alas, alas! how many are still trying to be justified by the "law of works," instead of the "law of faith" through our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a

fearful thing for men to trample "under foot the Son of God," as *they* verily do who turn aside from this "law of faith"—the law of the "Spirit," the law of "GRACE"—to follow the *old law of works!* In Romans 8: 4 the apostle says: "The righteousness of the law" is "FULFILLED *in us*, who walk *not* after the flesh, but after the SPIRIT."

So much on the subject of the moral law, from Paul's letter to the Romans. Now let us turn to his letter to the Galatians, and see what we can find there. In the first place, I wish to quote again, as applicable to the "*law*," what I have once already quoted as applicable to the seventh-day Sabbath:

"But there be some that trouble you, and would *pervert the gospel of Christ*. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1: 7–9.)

One more passage I will quote from Paul's letter to the Galatians, which I think applicable to our times, in regard to the "*law*," as well as to the apostle's times:

"But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is *not justified* by the *works* of the *law*, but by *the faith of Jesus Christ*, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that *we* might be *justified by the faith of*

Christ, and *not* by the *works* of the *law:* for by the *works* of the *law* shall *no flesh* be *justified.*" (Gal. 2: 14–16.)

And the apostle adds:

"For as many as are of the works of the law *are under the curse:* for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But that *no man* is *justified* by the *law* in the *sight of God*, is evident: for, The just shall live by *faith.* And the *law* is *not* of *faith:* but, The man that doeth them shall live in them. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law*, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that the *blessing of Abraham* might come on the Gentiles *through Jesus Christ* that *we* might receive the *promise* of the *Spirit through faith.*" (Gal. 3: 10–14.)

How important this testimony of the apostle. And we solemnly warn all those who are trying to "be justified by the deeds of the law," to make their escape as soon as possible from "UNDER THE CURSE!"

But the apostle continues:

"For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? *It was added because* of transgression, *till the seed should come* to whom the promise was made; and it was *ordained by angels* in the hand of a mediator."

He then inquires:

"Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But *before faith came*, we were kept under the law, *shut up unto the faith* which should afterwards be revealed." (Gal. 3: 18, 19, 21–23.)

Thus we see that, although *faith is come*, yet many keep themselves "*under the law*—SHUT UP!" And while they are thus "*shut up*" in the old prison-house of the "*law*," they still try to teach others who have *come out into the broad daylight of the Gospel!* Take heed, ye teachers of the "*law*," for you "ARE UNDER THE CURSE!" (Gal. 3: 10.)

But now let us inquire, What was the "law" for? The apostle Paul shall answer:

"Wherefore the *law* was *our schoolmaster* to bring us *unto Christ*, that *we* might be *justified by faith*. But *after* that *faith is come*, *we* are *no longer under a schoolmaster*."

We have at last reached the *grave* of THE OLD DEAD "SCHOOLMASTER!" And let us take heed, and follow no more the teachings of a *dead* "schoolmaster!" For we are *no longer under a schoolmaster*, but under CHRIST JESUS—the SON OF GOD. For "when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, *made under the law*, to *redeem* them that *were under the law*, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." (Gal. 4: 4–6.) "Stand fast, therefore, in the *liberty* wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the *yoke of bondage*." For "*Christ* is become of *no effect* unto you, *whosoever* of *you* are justified by the *law; ye are fallen from grace*." (Gal. 5: 1, 4.) Therefore whosoever shall follow that *old*

dead "SCHOOLMASTER"—the "*law*"—instead of following Christ; we will say of them as the apostle said of the Galatians: "YE ARE FALLEN FROM GRACE!"

The Lord forgive me the error of my *head* which led me to fall "*from grace*," in thus going back so far as to try for three years to be "justified by the deeds of the law" by keeping the seventh-day Sabbath! Let us take heed, and attend to the warning the apostle gave to the Philippians:

"Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision. For we are the circumcision, which worship God *in the spirit*, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have *no confidence in the flesh*." (ch. 3: 2, 3.)

Why, Paul; "no confidence in the flesh," or in the "law?" "No confidence" whatever, although he had tried it thoroughly, as he continues and says:

"Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more. Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the *law*, a *Pharisee;* concerning zeal, persecuting the Church; touching the *righteousness* which is in the *law blameless*." (v. 4–6)

Now, for a few moments, let us attend to the apostle's rule of working out "LOSS" AND "GAIN."

"But what things *were gain* to me, those I counted *loss* for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count *all things* but *loss* for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the *loss of all things*, and do count them but dung,

that I may *win Christ*, and be *found in him, not having mine own righteousness*, which is of the *law*, but that which is through the *faith of Christ*, the righteousness which is of God by *faith*: that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; *if by any means* I might attain unto the *resurrection of the dead*." (Phil. 3: 7–11.)

Let us now attend to the apostle's conclusion of this whole matter; for he says:

"Let us therefore, as many as be *perfect*, be *thus minded*: and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the *same rule*, let us mind the *same thing*. Brethren, be followers together of me, and *mark* them which walk *so as* ye have us *for an ensample*." (Phil. 3: 15–17.)

Here I must repeat: "*Let* US *therefore, as many as be* PERFECT, *be* THUS MINDED;" and "*let* US *walk by the* SAME RULE, *let* US MIND THE SAME THING;" and let us "*mark them which walk so*," as we have the apostle "*for an* ENSAMPLE." But did Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, ever teach *them* to observe "*the seventh-day Sabbath?*" Never! Did he ever shun to declare to them "*all the counsel of God?*" Never! Did he ever keep back anything "*that was profitable*" for the people to hear? Never! But he surely did keep back *the seventh-day Sabbath!* Therefore, it was *not* "*profitable*" for *him* to teach it: and as we have him *for an ensample*, we had better "*mind the same thing*, and *walk by the same rule*." But those who choose to follow the teachings of the OLD DEAD "SCHOOLMASTER," instead of follow-

ing *Christ* and the *apostles*, will probably teach the seventh-day Sabbath. It is said:

"John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me; for he was before me. And of his fullness have all we received, and grace for grace. For the *law* was given by *Moses*, but *grace* and *truth* came by Jesus Christ." (John 1: 15–17.)

Hence the apostle says:

"For *Christ* is the *end* of the *law* for righteousness to *every one* that *believeth*. For *Moses* describeth the righteousness which is of the *law*, that the man which doeth those things shall live by them. But the righteousness which is of *faith* speaketh on this wise: Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into heaven? that is, to bring Christ down from above: or, who shall descend into the deep? that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead. But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is *the word of faith*, which we preach; that if thou shalt *confess* with thy mouth the *Lord Jesus*, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. 10: 4–9.)

So we see that *Christ* is the *end* of the old *law of works;* but he is also the *beginning* of the *new law of faith*. And so it is written of Christ: "There ariseth another priest, who is made *not after* the *law* of a *carnal commandment*, but after the power of *an endless life*." (Heb. 7: 15, 16.) Therefore, while the old "*schoolmaster*" was sickening and dying, it was necessary to have a new law, or new commandments, proclaimed: hence Christ declared to them on one occasion A NEW COMMANDMENT in the following Scriptures: "A *new commandment* I give unto you, That

ye *love one another; as* I have *loved you,* that ye also love one another. By *this* shall *all* men *know* that ye are my disciples, *if ye have love one to another.* This is *my commandment,* That ye love one another, as I have loved you. These things I *command* you, that ye love one another." (John. 13: 34, 35; 15: 12, 17.)

In this connection, though the reader ~~my~~ think it irrelevant, we have an "example" given us by our Savior of the practical bearing of this "new commandment." It is found in the first part of John 13, in the narrative of Christ washing the disciples' feet.

As some have contended that Jesus *commanded* his people to attend to the washing of feet, in connection with the ordinance of the Lord's supper, as a part of the ordinance itself, I am here led to say, this is a mistake! It is not so! There is no *command* or precept about it. The Greek word for *command,* or precept, as used by the Savior in this connection, is *entolee;* meaning, "precept, commandment, law," etc. But the original word, used by Christ in John 13: 15, when he says, "I have given you an *example,*" is *hupodigma;* meaning "an example, *proposed for imitation or admonition,*" etc. (Greenfield's Lexicon.) And in this case we shall find that the "example" of Christ was for "*admonition,*" for the disciples deserved it. The case was this: The disciples had first been engaged in a "*strife*" among themselves, to see "which of them should be accounted the *greatest*"

(Lk. 22: 24), and the spirit of selfishness and rivalry was in direct violation of the true import of the "*new commandment.*" Hence, "their Lord and Master" just set them an "*example*" of humility and "*love*" toward each other; they must be *servants* to each other, and never strive to see "which of them should be accounted the *greatest.*" Thus we see that "*love* one to another" is the "*fulfilling*" of Christ's *new law* or *commandments;* as we find in Romans 13: 8–10:

"Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that *loveth* another hath *fulfilled* the *law.* For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and *if there be any other commandment,* it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely: *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.* Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore *love* is the *fulfilling of the law.*"

It appears that this "*example*" of Christ was enough for the disciples while they lived, for we never find them, after this, washing each other's feet in connection with the Lord's supper. They doubtless remembered this "*example*" of their "Lord and Master" to "love one another," *as* Christ had loved them; and so there was no more "*strife*" among them at the Lord's table to "see which of them should be accounted the *greatest.*" And so would we recommend to all who feel like "strife," to see who shall "be accounted the greatest," just to *wash one another's feet* until they "*have love one to another.*" But we need not wash each other's feet, as a part of the ordinance

of the Lord's supper, because Christ *commanded* us to do it; for he never did any such thing. But under similar circumstances, we had better follow the "*example*" of "our Lord and Master;" and then, as he says: "If ye know these things, happy are ye if do them;" yes, "happy" are we, if we only keep the "*new* commandment" to "*love* one another," for there is no *unhappiness* or *fear in "love."* We shall be "*happy*" if we only follow Christ's "*example;*" for "*perfect love* casteth out fear." "God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our love made *perfect*, that we may have *boldness* in the *day of judgment:* because as he is, so are we in this world. There is *no fear in love;* but perfect love casteth out fear, because *fear* hath *torment.* He that feareth is not made perfect in love." (1 John 4: 16–18.) What is the new law called? It is called "*the perfect law of liberty*"—"*the royal law;*" as we find in James 1: 25; 2: 8, 12. We are sure that it is the *new law of Christ* that is here called "the perfect law of liberty;" for the apostle says: "The law [that is, the old law, the old "*schoolmaster*"] *made nothing perfect;*" but "it was the bringing in [margin] of a better hope;" as we learn from Hebrews 7: 19; Acts 13: 39: "For the *law* made *nothing perfect*, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God." "And by him all that believe are justi-

fied from all things from which ye *could not be justified* by the *law of Moses.*"

Those who contend for the seventh-day Sabbath, say this "*royal law,*" as in James 2: 8, is the old law of the Decalogue; and thus they try to enforce their theory in regard to the Sabbath. But they thus "*pervert the Gospel of Christ:*" for James says: "If ye *fulfill* the *royal law* according to the *Scripture,* Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well." What law is this, then, which the apostle says is "according to the Scripture?" It is this: "*Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*" And where do we find this law? In the Decalogue? We will see. Said the disciples:

"Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.* On these *two* commandments hang *all* the *law* and the prophets." (Matt. 22: 36–40.)

And let us remember that this language is not found in the Decalogue, as we can see by Deuteronomy 6: 5; Leviticus 19: 18.

We might say that the Lord Jesus *has* "fulfilled," or *will* "fulfill" the law, rather than to say he abrogated it. We will first notice the passage found in Matthew 5: 17, 18:

"Think not that I am come to *destroy* the law or the prophets: I am not come to *destroy,* but to *fulfill.* For verily I say

unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till *all* be *fulfilled*;" or "*established*." (Emphatic Diaglott.)

Let us take particular notice of our Savior's language in this passage: "I am not come to *destroy*, but to *fulfill*. If, then, he *fulfills* any portion of the law, of course he does not *destroy* it. He says in Luke: "The law and the prophets were *until John*," etc.; and then adds: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to *fail*." Now he does not mean that he will *not fulfill any* of the law or the prophets "till heaven and earth pass;" and thus "*all* be fulfilled" at one time, after the heavens and earth have passed away! for he says, "*I* AM *come* to fulfill." Hence, whatever he *fulfilled* of the law and the prophets, he did "*not destroy*;" neither did it "*fail*." And if he fulfilled a part at his first advent, and then completes the fulfillment at any other time, none of it *fails*, and none of it is *destroyed*.

Now to the word, and to the testimony. What did the Lord Jesus fulfill at his first advent? Why, says one, he fulfilled *all* the *ceremonial* law of Moses. Not so fast—hold a moment. Was the "*passover*" *fulfilled* at the first advent? Certainly it was, says the objector. *Certainly it was not*, says the Scriptures; for we read:

"And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat *this passover* with you before I suffer. For I say

unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, *until it be* FULFILLED *in the kingdom of God.*" (Lk. 22: 14–16.)

Thus we see that Christ did *not* fulfill the "*passover,*" but it is to "*be fulfilled in the kingdom of God*" —at "the marriage supper of the Lamb" (Rev. 19: 9), when as Christ says, "Ye may eat and drink at *my table in* MY KINGDOM." (Lk. 22: 30.)

STRIKING POINTS OF ANALOGY BETWEEN THE PASSOVER AND THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH.

The following are some of the points which impress the mind of the close observer. (1) Both had their origin in the times of types and shadows.

THE PASSOVER.	THE SABBATH.
"And this day shall be unto you for a *memorial;* and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout *your generations:* ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance *forever.* Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses; for whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, *that soul shall be cut off from Israel.* And in the *first day* there shall be a *holy* convocation, and in the *seventh day* there shall be a *holy* convocation to you; *no manner of*	"Speak thou also unto the *children of Israel,* saying, Verily my Sabbath ye shall keep: for it is a *sign* between me and you throughout *your generations;* that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath THEREFORE; for it is *holy* unto *you:* every one that defileth it shall *surely be put to death:* for whosoever doeth *any work therein,* that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, *holy* to the Lord. Whoso-

work shall be done *in them*, save that which every man must eat, that only may be done of you. And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for in *this self-same day* have I brought *your armies* out of the land of Egypt: THEREFORE shall *ye observe* this day in *your generations forever*." (Ex. 12: 14–17.)

ever doeth *any work* in the Sabbath-day, *he shall surely be put to death*. Wherefore the *children of Israel* shall keep *the* Sabbath, to observe *the* Sabbath *throughout their generations* for a *perpetual* covenant. It is a *sign* between me and the *children of Israel forever*: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." (Ex. 31: 13–17)

From these portions of Scripture, we learn that (2) both were "*holy*" institutions; (3) both forbade all manner of "*work*;" (4) both were for a "*memorial*" or "*sign*;" (5) both were to be observed by a particular class of people—"*the children of Israel*;" (6) both were *limited*, not only to a particular class of persons; but also, as in respect to the time for their observance, "*throughout your generations*," or "*forever*;" (7) in both cases, the penalty for a violation was, "*that soul shall be cut off from Israel*"—or "*he shall surely be put to death*." We also learn from the New Testament Scriptures that (8) both were to cease in their observance, after the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, throughout the Gospel dispensation (Lk. 22: 16; Heb. 4: 8); (9) both had a *substitute* appointed, viz: for "*the passover*"—"THE LORD'S SUPPER" (1 Cor. 11: 20): and for *the Sabbath*"—"THE LORD'S DAY" (Rev. 1: 10); and (10) both were to

have their complete fulfillment in "*the kingdom of God*," or in "*the new earth*." (Lk. 22: 16, 30; Rev. 19: 9; Heb. 4: 6–11; Rev. 20: 4, 6.)

CHAPTER II.

THE LORD'S DAY THE TRUE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

About sixty-two years after the resurrection of Christ—or after the Christian Sabbath began—the beloved John, who was our brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, while he was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the Word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ, said, "*I was in the spirit on* THE LORD'S DAY," etc. Here shines the clear blazing light of the Christian Sabbath, according to the Gospel of THE LIVING JESUS: notwithstanding so many are trying, with a "*veil upon their hearts,*" to throw a dark cloud over the whole thing, by saying, that the "Lord's day" here spoken of "is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment," as found in Exodus 20: 8–11. But how many, through ignorance, or something worse, "pervert the Gospel of Christ."

The word here rendered "*Lord's,*" is in the Greek *kuriakos*, and it is found elsewhere in the New Testament but *once;* and it there refers to the Lord's [*kuriakos*] supper. (1 Cor. 11: 20.) The question

now arises, Whose "supper" is here referred to? Is it the Lord JEHOVAH'S supper? or is it the Lord JESUS CHRIST'S supper? All must confess that it is the Lord Jesus Christ's supper. Then is the "LORD'S [*kuriakos*] DAY" (Rev. 1: 10) the Lord JESUS CHRIST'S day? Thus we have the plain word of God to establish this long-disputed truth. Here, then, we have the proof that "the passover" had, as its substitute, the "Lord's [*kuriakos*] supper;" and as a substitute for "the seventh-day Sabbath," the "Lord's [*kuriakos*] day," as I have above stated: the *passover* to have its complete fulfillment in "the kingdom of God" (Lk. 22: 16); and just so of the *Sabbath*. (Heb. 4: 3; Rev. 20: 4.)

If, then, as the apostle says, "*Christ is the end of the law;*" and he having fulfilled a great part already, and the last to "be fulfilled in the kingdom of God;" we see that the "*law*" is not all fulfilled at one time; and that not until the heavens and the earth pass away. Hence, some fail entirely in the use they make of Matthew 5: 17–19, in support of the perpetuity of the seventh-day Sabbath. And to those who apply v. 19 to such as observe the first day of the week for the Sabbath, I would say, Take heed and beware, or you, yourselves, may "be called the least in the kingdom of heaven."

What "commandments" are "these" which the Savior speaks of in v. 19? Surely they must be "*these*" which he is presenting to his hearers in this discourse.

And are they the commandments "of old time?" or are they the commandments of which he *himself* is the giver? The following, from this same discourse of our Savior, will prove whether *"these last commandments"* are those of which the disciples had *heard that it was said by them of* OLD TIME—or by *the old dead* "schoolmaster"—or whether they were "these" commandments put forth by the LIVING JESUS, in this emphatic language: "BUT I SAY UNTO YOU," etc. Jesus speaks from *"a mountain"*—hear him:

"Ye have *heard* that it was *said* by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. *But I say unto you*, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire. Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily, I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

"Ye have *heard* that it *was said* by them of *old time*, Thou shalt not commit adultery: *But I say unto you*, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole

body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. *It hath been said,* Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: *but I say unto you,* that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery. Again, ye have *heard* that it *hath been said* by them of *old time,* Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: *but I say unto you,* swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. Ye have *heard* that it *hath been said,* An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: *but I say unto you,* that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away. Ye have *heard* that it *hath been said,* Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. *But I say unto you,* love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so? Be ye there-

fore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." (Matt. 5: 21–48.)

Here are NEW LAWS, or a revision of the old, superior to those of the *old dead "schoolmaster!"* This also puts to silence all cavil about the ten commandments," or the Decalogue, being superceded by the commandments or laws of Christ: for in this case there are at least *two* of the commandments of the Decalogue especially referred to, viz.: the sixth and seventh—"Thou shalt not kill," and, "Thou shalt not commit adultery."

If any are disposed to think that the Lord Jesus Christ's laws, as found in the New Testament, are more lenient than those of the Old, let them take for an example what is said in the above quotation, and especially what is said in regard to the sin of "adultery," and they will find that the New Testament laws are more strict than those of the Old: for Christ makes a man *guilty of "adultery"* who shall even *look* on a woman *"to lust after her."* But says the caviler, Christ let the woman go, who was taken in the very act of adultery, without condemning her. Without condemning her for what? I ask. He did not, to be sure, condemn her to *"be stoned,"* as *"Moses in the law commanded,"* for the sake of gratifying the woman's "accusers"—those old "hypocrites"—who themselves were guilty of the double crime of (1) complicity with the woman; and (2) of "tempting" *Christ,* that *"they might accuse him!"* But he *did*

condemn the woman *as a sinner!* and said, "*Go and* SIN NO MORE!"

Did the Lord Jesus keep the seventh-day Sabbath? He evidently did, as he was "*made under the law*" (Gal. 4: 4), and was "circumcised;" he no doubt observed the Sabbath, as it ought to have been observed at that time; although his manner of keeping it, however, was such that the Pharisees accused him of breaking it, because he did not observe their *traditions*, which they had connected with the observance of that day.

There is no doubt but the women mentioned in Luke 23: 55, after they had "prepared spices and ointments" for the body of Jesus, returned and rested the Sabbath-day according to the "commandment;" yea, the "*fourth commandment.*" Good, says the Sabbatarian. And I too say, Good; because I have no doubt of its truth. But when this matter shall be critically examined, I think all candid minds will acknowledge that this was THE LAST SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH EVER KEPT ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT: as I believe the following facts will abundantly prove. The original Greek words for Sabbath, as found in the New Testament, in their singular and plural form, are *Sabbaton*, and *Sabbata*. The number of times these words occur in the New Testament is *sixty-eight*. They are found in different books, as follows: in Matthew, *eleven* times; in Mark, *twelve* times; in Luke, *twenty* times; in John, *thir-*

teen times; in Acts, *ten* times; in 1 Corinthians, *once;* and in Colossians, *once.* These words are transferred (not translated) into our English version, in all, *fifty-nine* times; and thus called Sabbath, or Sabbath-days, etc. But the translator saw fit to render the word *Sabbaton,* by the word "*week,*" in *nine* cases out of the whole number *sixty-eight,* and these *nine* cases are found in the following places: in Matthew 28: 1; Mark 16: 2, 9; Luke 18: 12; 24: 1; John 20: 1, 19; Acts 20: 7; 1 Corinthians 16: 2. In Matthew it reads, "In the end of the Sabbath [*Sabbaton*], as it began to dawn toward the first [*day,* is a word supplied by the translators] of the *week* [*Sabbaton*], came Mary," etc. In Mark: "And very early in the morning, the first of the *week* [*Sabbaton*], they came," etc. "Now when Jesus was risen early the first of the *week* [*Sabbaton*], he appeared," etc. In Luke: "I fast twice in the *week* [*Sabbaton*], I give tithes," etc. Now upon the first of the *week* [*Sabbaton*], very early in the morning," etc. In John: "The first of the *week* [*Sabbaton*] cometh Mary Magdalene early," etc. "Then the same day, at evening, being the first of the *week* [*Sabbaton*], when the doors were shut," etc. In Acts: "And upon the first of the *week* [*Sabbaton*], when the disciples came together to break bread," etc. In 1 Corinthians: "Upon the first of the *week* [*Sabbaton*] let every one of you lay by him in store," etc.

Now let us turn back to Matthew 28: 1, and see

if we can ascertain the true import of this word "*week*," as it has been thus found in the cases above referred to. It appears that the word *Sabbaton*, as found in this verse, occurs twice, and in both instances it is in the *plural* form; and this being the case, the true rendering of the passage requires us to read it, in substance, like this: At the end of Sabbaths, in the beginning of the first of Sabbaths, etc. Or as Mark has it: And very early in the first of Sabbaths (*lit.* of one of Sabbaths), etc. But Luke and John appear to have it still stronger: And in the first of *the* Sabbaths, etc; the definite article *the* being placed before the noun *Sabbaton*. Now it is evident that if the translators had *transferred* the word *Sabbaton*, in these *nine* cases just examined, as they did in the other *fifty-nine* instances above referred to, then we should have had less difficulty than we now have, and we should see that *at the* END *of the seventh-day Sabbaths* (or at the end of the Jewish Sabbath—which was given to the "*children of Israel*" to be a "*sign*" unto *them* "throughout their generations") THERE *would be the* BEGINNING *of the* LORD JESUS CHRIST'S DAY, or SABBATH. Or in other words, where one series of days *ended*, there another series of days *began*.

And this change of days was marked by the most important events that ever transpired in the history of man. "The veil of the temple was rent in twain," "the middle wall of partition" between Jews and

Gentiles was "broken down," and thus they were "made both one." "Our Savior Jesus Christ" had "abolished death," and had "brought LIFE and IMMORTALITY to light through the gospel"—the saints were begotten "again unto a lively hope by the RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST FROM THE DEAD"—the LIVING JESUS WAS VICTOR over "DEATH" and the "GRAVE"—*old things had passed away*, BEHOLD, ALL THINGS HAD BECOME NEW.

In confirmation of this truth, that the seventh-day Sabbath was to cease after the resurrection of our Lord from the dead, is found the fact, that out of the whole number of times the seventh-day Sabbath is mentioned in the New Testament, it is never spoken of by either Christ or any of the apostles as a precept, or command; but it is only spoken of as a *historical* fact. And it is thus worthy of special attention that, whenever the seventh-day Sabbath is mentioned in the New Testament, it is always to be found in the five *historical books;* and *never* ONCE *found in the epistles of any of the apostles.* And hence, as I have before stated, so I repeat, that in *no instance* is the seventh-day Sabbath spoken of by either Christ or his apostles *as a command or precept.* I know our Savior said that he was "Lord of the Sabbath-day;" and this shows that he had the power to *change it* whenever he pleased. It is true, that in the Acts of the apostles we find mention made of the apostle Paul speaking to the Jews in their synagogues on the Sabbath;

but never do we find any of the other apostles holding meetings on the seventh-day Sabbath; and there is but *one single instance* where we have an account of any of the apostles holding a meeting on that day, which appears to have been for a season of mutual worship among themselves, and that is the one mentioned in Acts 16: 13, where it is said: "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made: and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither."

The passage in Acts 17: 2, where it is said: "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto *them* [the Jews], and three Sabbath-days reasoned with *them out of the Scriptures*," only shows that Paul was in Thessalonica, in a Jewish "synagogue," and his "manner was," when he could get an opportunity, he would "reason with *them* out of the Scriptures; opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead:" and although *they* were ever so much offended with him, he would "preach unto" *them* "that this Jesus" "is Christ." And the apostle's "manner," in thus going into Jewish synogogues on their Sabbath, was very much like my "manner," I conclude, when I believed in the seventh-day Sabbath; for I attended a great many more meetings on the "*first day of the week*" than on any other, for the very good reason, that it was much easier to get the people out to meeting on

this day than on the day that I then believed was the Sabbath. In Acts 18: 4, it is said: "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Where was Paul at this time? At Corinth. Who was he with? He was with a *Jew* named Aquila, and his wife Priscilla. "And because he was of the same craft, he abode with them and wrought: (for by their occupation they were tent-makers.) And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and *persuaded* the *Jews* and the *Greeks*. And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in spirit, and testified to the *Jews* that Jesus was Christ. And when *they opposed themselves*, and *blasphemed*, he shook his raiment, and said unto *them*, *Your* blood be upon *your own heads;* I am clean: *from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles.*" (Acts 18: 1–6.)

The apostle did not find this very pleasant "seventh-day" *worship*, did he? These were not *brethren*, that Paul was with on this occasion, were they? "And when *they opposed themselves*, and BLASPHEMED," Paul left *them*, saying—"*From* HENCEFORTH *I will go to the* GENTILES." Do we have any account that the apostle after this had any more meetings on the *seventh-day Sabbath?* Never! This was the last, that we have any account of. But we do find him holding meetings with his *brethren* after this; but *their* meetings for *worship* were on the "*first day of the week*"—*Sabbaton.* (Acts 20: 7.)

CHAPTER III.

THE TWO COVENANTS.

"He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second."

In confirmation of what has been already argued in relation to the old "law" being "done away," and with it the seventh-day Sabbath, I will present the following in regard to the "old" and "new" "covenants," which embrace the plan of salvation of a lost world. But in doing so, I shall confine myself mostly to the epistle to the Hebrews, where we have presented to us the most perfect analysis of the two systems of divine arrangement by which man may escape death and obtain eternal life. While treating upon the subject of the old and new covenants, the apostle says: "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." (ch. 7: 12.) Paul labored to convince the Hebrews, or Jews, that their system of worship, or their "ordinances of divine service" (ch. 9: 1), were only "imposed on them until the time of reformation" (v. 10); and that now there had been "verily a dis-

annulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof" (ch. 7: 18); and that they were now under "a great high priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God" (ch. 4: 14), "of whom"—as he said—"we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing." (ch. 5: 11.) And it is the same with me now: I "have many things to say" on this important subject, but they are "hard to be uttered, seeing" there are so many who "are dull of hearing." Yea, there are many now, as then, who love the teachings of the old dead "schoolmaster," far better than those of the LIVING JESUS!

We will now spend a few moments in turning to the Old Testament, in order to prove that the old "covenant" referred to, was that which was written on "two tables of stone," and that only. And if this is found to be really true, it will furnish an argument which will overthrow all that can be said in favor of Judaism, or the seventh-day Sabbath.

What did the two tables of stone contain? Let the following answer:

"And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. And he declared unto you *his covenant* which he commanded you to perform, even *ten commandments;* and he wrote them upon *two tables* of *stone.*" (Deut. 4: 12, 13.)

Where were these tables of stone kept?

"And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing,

the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly: and the Lord gave them unto me. And I turned myself, and came down from the mount, and *put the tables in the ark* which I had made, and there they be, as the Lord commanded me." (Deut. 10: 4, 5.)

This shows that the tables were put into an "ark" made for that purpose. Where was the ark then put?

"And thou shalt hang up the veil under the taches, that thou mayest bring in thither within the veil the *ark* of the testimony: and the veil shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy. And thou shalt put the mercy-seat upon the *ark* of the testimony in the most holy place." (Ex. 26: 33, 34.) "And the priests brought in the *ark of the covenant* of the Lord unto his place, to the oracle of the house, into the *most holy place*, even under the wings of the cherubims. For the cherubims spread forth their wings over the place of the ark, and the cherubims covered the ark and the staves thereof above. There was *nothing in the ark save the two tables* which Moses put therein *at Horeb*, when the Lord made a COVENANT with the children of Israel, when they came out of Egypt." (2 Chron. 5: 7, 8, 10.)

With this agrees the testimony of the apostle Paul:

"Then verily the *first covenant* had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made, the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil the tabernacle, which is called the holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the *ark of the covenant* overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and *the tables of* THE COVENANT; and over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy-seat; of which we cannot now speak particularly." (Heb. 9: 1–5.)

Now let it ever be remembered, that under the "*first covenant,*" God's dwelling-place for his people —or his "mercy-seat"—was "between the cherubims;" as the following passage will more fully show:

"And the cherubims shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy-seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; toward the mercy-seat shall the faces of the cherubims be. And thou shalt put the mercy-seat above upon the ark; and *in the ark* thou shalt put the *testimony* that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of *all things* which I will give thee *in commandment* unto the children of Israel." (Ex. 25: 20–22.)

And strange as it may appear to us, none but the *high priest* alone was ever permitted to approach the "mercy-seat," and that only *once a year*, as follows:

"Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest once alone every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people." (Heb. 9: 6, 7.)

Hence, we see, that God's ancient people had no privilege of approaching the "mercy-seat" for themselves.

But let us here pause a moment, and inquire, *Where are now the "two tables of stone?" Where?* And echo must answer, WHERE? For that once-holy place, where those tables were kept, is now destroyed; and the veil which kept all but the high

priest from the mercy-seat, has been "rent in twain from the top to the bottom;" and the "*ark*," and the "*two tables of stone*," have also been *destroyed*. The priesthood, which made atonement for the people at that altar, has been *changed;* and as the apostle says, there has been a *change also of the law*, or of THE COVENANT. If, therefore, the tables of stone which contained the law, or the covenant, for keeping the seventh-day Sabbath—the most holy place where the tables and covenant were kept, the mercy-seat above them—and God's ancient dwelling-place "between the cherubims" are *all destroyed;* and *a new and living way*, which the living Jesus "hath consecrated [or *new made*—margin] for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh" (ch. 10: 20); I say, if all this change has taken place, WHERE IS THERE NOW ANY LAW OR COVENANT TO BE FOUND FOR KEEPING THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH? Let the one who claims there is such point it out if he can!

But says the objector: "I do not believe the *new covenant* is now in force; neither do I believe it can be until God writes his laws upon the heart, and all shall know him from the least to the greatest: and that, of course, cannot be until Christ comes the second time; and hence the law, or covenant, which contains the law for the Sabbath, will hold good until the end of the world, or until Christ comes. But if it can be shown that the new covenant *is now in force*, then I will give up that you are right." Very well.

Now in regard to this objection and admission, we will test the whole matter by the word of truth. The particular prophecy in relation to this new covenant is found in Jeremiah 31: 31–34. But as the apostle quotes this in Hebrews 8: 10–13, I trust all will be candid enough to take the same view of it as is given in the New Testament; and hence we proceed:

"For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put *my* LAWS *into their mind*, and write them in their *hearts:* and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, a *new covenant* he *hath made the first old.* Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away."

The objection to my view, as has just been raised, consists in this: When this new covenant is in force, the Lord is to put his laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts, and "all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest." Now the first question to be settled is this: To whom, or to what class of persons, does this "all" refer? Does it refer to all mankind living at that time? Or does it refer to all of that particular class who believe in, or observe this covenant? It must refer to a *particular class*, and *not to everybody*, as will be seen by the

passage just quoted. The covenant is made "*with the house of Israel.*" Now let it be remembered, that the Lord has nowhere even intimated that he will ever make a covenant with the Gentiles, as such, and then bring in the "house of Jacob" under such a covenant as that; but, as we see by the passage under consideration, he has promised to make a covenant "with the house of Israel:" and all candid minds will see that the Gentiles will be brought in under this. This great truth is clearly presented in Romans 11. The apostle inquires, "What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded" (margin—*hardened*); and then adds, "through their fall salvation is come to the Gentiles." (Rom. 11: 7, 11.) Hence, we see, that Israel is not grafted in among the Gentiles, but the Gentiles are *grafted in among them*, the natural branches. Therefore Israel proper are the natural branches of "*their own olive tree,*" and the Gentiles are grafted in among them. Hence the blindness—or hardness—is happened to Israel, "until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. And so *all Israel* shall be saved." The apostle then immediately adds, "For this is my *covenant* unto them, *when* I shall *take away their* sins." (Rom. 11: 25–27.) Now if we can find *when* God shall take away their sins, *then* we find when his *new covenant* shall be with them. We have now reached a point where I will propose to my objector, above alluded to, the following question:

When will the Lord take away, or forgive men their sins? Will it be in this world, while Christ is the "mediator between God and men?" Or will it not be until Christ comes the second time, to "judge the quick and the dead?" Oh! says the objector, in this world, certainly. Very well. This shows us that if men's sins are forgiven them in this world (Matt. 12: 31, 32), then the new covenant is for this world; for we are now considering the passage which says, "This is my *covenant* unto them, *when I shall take away their sins.*" But again, the Greek word here rendered "take away," is *aphaireo;* and it is found elsewhere in the New Testament but *once*, when it is applied to sins; and this will be found in Hebrews 10: 4: "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away [*aphaireo*] sins." So of the passage in Romans: "This is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away [*aphaireo*] their sins." By this, then, we learn that it was impossible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sins under the first covenant, and therefore those who lived under the first covenant must have their sins forgiven by virtue of the "mediator of the New Testament"—or covenant—as we learn by the following passage:

"And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under *the first testament* [or covenant], they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." (Heb. 9: 15.)

But a few words here in relation to this word which is translated *testament*, in this last quotation. In the Greek, this word is *diatheekee;* and it is found in the New Testament thirty-three times. It is rendered *covenant* twenty, and *testament* thirteen times. Its meaning according to Greenfield is, "any disposition, arrangement, institution, or dispensation," etc. Thus we are to understand this word *diatheekee* in the sense of covenant; and to mean the Lord's *institution*, or *arrangement*, to save men whether under the *old* or the *new* dispensation. The first *diatheekee*, or covenant, written upon "tables of stone," is "disannulled" (Heb. 7: 18); but the *diatheekee* or covenant written "in fleshly tables of the heart," is *now* for the benefit and salvation of men. We have already seen that sins could not be taken away by virtue of the first covenant. Let us now examine and see if sins can be taken away, or forgiven, under the "*new covenant.*" The apostle explains this by saying:

"The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that *could not make* him that did the service *perfect*, as pertaining to the *conscience;* which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them *until the time of reformation.* * * * For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without

spot to God, *purge your conscience from dead works* to serve the living God?" (Heb. 9: 8–14.)

But the apostle continues and says:

"For the *law* having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, *can never* with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually *make the comers thereunto perfect.* For then would they not have ceased to be offered: because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is *not possible* that the blood of bulls and of goats should *take away sins.* * * * *He taketh away the first* [covenant], that he may *establish* the *second.* By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." (Heb. 10: 1–10.)

And again he says:

"Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, *This is the covenant* that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put *my* LAWS *into their hearts,* and *in their minds will I write them:* and their sins and iniquities will I remember *no more.* Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin. Having therefore, brethren, *boldness to enter into the holiest* by the blood of Jesus, by a *new and living way,* which he has consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a *true heart* in *full assurance* of faith, having our *hearts* sprinkled from an *evil conscience,* and our bodies washed with pure water." (Heb. 10: 15–22.)

By these three portions of Scripture we are shown how and when sins are taken away. In the first it is said: "The Holy Ghost this signifying;" that "gifts

and sacrifices" under the first covenant "could not make" any one "perfect, as pertaining to the conscience." But under the new covenant, Christ being come a high priest of good things to come by his own blood through the eternal Spirit could *purge the conscience;* so we can serve the living God. Hence, we see that our sins can be taken away by the blood of Christ, and not merely carried into the wilderness on the head of a "live goat," as was the case under the first covenant.

In the second it is said, The law, being a shadow of good things to come, *can never* with those sacrifices make *the comers thereunto perfect.* For if this could have been done, the worshipers once purged would "have had *no more conscience of sins.* But in those sacrifices there is a *remembrance again made of sins* EVERY YEAR." Because it was not possible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sins. But when Jesus Christ came, he said, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." And so Jesus, our High Priest, took away the first covenant, that he might establish the second covenant. And by this will, or covenant, *we are sanctified.*

In the third it is said, The Holy Ghost also is a witness to *us,* as it has been said before, *This is the covenant* that the Lord promised unto our fathers; and under it, brethren, we have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a NEW and *living way;* which has been "consecrated for us."

Then "let us draw near with a true heart," "having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience."

But again we inquire, who are the "all" referred to, who are to know the Lord? Let Isaiah the prophet answer:

"For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, *neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed*, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee." "And *all thy children* shall be *taught* of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of *thy children*." (ch. 54: 10, 13.)

This says "*all thy children* shall be taught of the Lord." Now what say, Mr. Objector? Does the "all" mean *all mankind?* or does it mean "*all thy children?*" It must mean all thy children, I think. Very true. But I have still more to present to prove that the "new covenant" is now in force. And in doing so I will continue to contrast the condition of the Church, or people of God, under the two different covenants.

We inquire, (1) *Where* were the two covenants written? The *first was* written on "*two tables of stone.*" The *second is* written "*in fleshly tables of the heart.*" (2 Cor. 3: 3.) We inquire, (2) *How* were these two covenants written? The *first* "with the finger of God." (Ex. 31: 18.) The *second* "with the Spirit of the living God." (2 Cor. 3: 3.) A few passages will now be presented to prove that *the work of the Spirit is now in the heart.*

"For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are

a law unto themselves: which show the work of *the law written in their hearts*, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing, one another." "Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the *Spirit in our hearts*." "For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined *in our hearts*, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son *into your hearts*, crying, Abba, Father." (Rom. 2: 14, 15; 2 Cor. 1: 21, 22; 4: 6; Gal. 4: 6.)

(3) Under the *first* covenant, did "*all*" have the privilege of *knowing the Lord* for themselves? That is, did *all* have the privilege of approaching God for themselves? *Could each for himself come to the "mercy-seat?"* Let the following answer:

"Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the *high priest alone once every year*, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people." (Heb. 6: 6, 7.)

The only person who was permitted to approach the "mercy-seat," was the high priest, alone, once a year. And hence no one knew whether he was accepted of God, only as the high priest performed the service for him, in the following very singular manner, viz:

"And when he [the high priest] hath made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he shall bring the live goat: and Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the *live goat*, and confess over *him all* the iniquities of the children of Israel, and *all* their transgressions in *all* their sins, *putting them upon the head of the*

goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: and the *goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities* unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." (Lev. 16: 20–22.)

Thus it appears that, all those who lived under the *old covenant*, never knew whether they were accepted of God *only as they learned it* from the high priest. And so it was, as the thing strikes one at this late day, that *a live goat might be called their savior.* And so it rather appears that those who are determined to hold on to the old *law*, or the *old covenant*, have for their teacher—instead of the LIVING JESUS—a *dead* "SCHOOLMASTER;" and for a Savior, "*a live goat.*" Oh! that the Spirit of the living God might write upon the hearts of every seventh-day Sabbath keeper this important truth: that the *same system* of religious ordinances, or ceremonies, which required a live goat to take away man's sins into the wilderness on *his head, was also the same system* of service which required the observance of the *seventh-day Sabbath!* And the *entire system* was established upon that old covenant which was written upon tables of stone, as will appear to any student of the Bible who will carefully examine the books of Exodus, and Leviticus, as compared with the epistle to the Hebrews.

It may be seen at a glance, by noticing the few portions of Scripture which follow, that the *whole system* was to *cease* with *their generations*—SEVENTH-

DAY SABBATH, and all; as they were only given to the children of Israel, "throughout their generations." I will now give a few instances, and my readers can satisfy themselves by examining them.

THE PASSOVER.—"And this day shall be unto *you* for a memorial; and *ye* shall keep it a feast to the Lord *throughout your generations:* ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever." (Ex. 12: 14.)

BURNT OFFERING.—"This shall be a continual burnt offering *throughout your generations.* * * * And I will dwell among the *children of Israel*, and will be their God." (Ex. 29: 42–45.)

SEVENTH-WEEK SABBATH.—"And he shall proclaim on the selfsame day, that it may be a *holy convocation* unto *you:* ye shall do no servile work therein: it shall be a statute forever in all your dwellings *throughout your generations.*" (Lev. 23: 21.)

DAY OF ATONEMENT.—"*Ye* shall do no manner of work: it shall be a statute forever *throughout your generations* in all your dwellings. It shall be unto *you a Sabbath of rest*, and ye shall afflict your souls: in the ninth day of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath." (Lev. 23: 31, 32.)

SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH.—"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou also unto the *children of Israel*, saying, Verily my Sabbaths *ye* shall keep; for it is a sign between me and *you throughout your generations;* that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. *Ye* shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you; every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done: but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath-day, he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the chil-

dren of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath *throughout their generations*, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and *the children of Israel* forever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed. And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God." (Ex. 31: 12–18.)

If any one is disposed to examine this particular question still further, he can look at Exodus 27: 20, 21; 30: 8, 10; 40: 15; Leviticus 10: 8, 9.

The Lord Jesus Christ was not permitted to enter the holy places made with hands. Although Christ was a high priest fitted to pass into "heaven itself," yet he was not permitted to enter the holy places in the temple; for he was not "after the order of Aaron," but was of the "tribe of Judah; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood." But although Christ could not enter "within the veil" of the temple, to view the "mercy-seat" there, yet when he expired upon the cross, by the power of God the Father, "the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom;" and thus was DEMOLISHED THE WHOLE SYSTEM UNDER THE FIRST COVENANT; and a "NEW AND LIVING WAY" was then opened up, whereby all might "know the Lord from the least to the greatest;" as the following passages will prove, taken from the three important witnesses, Jesus, Paul, and John:

I. JESUS.—**"All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth**

any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. *Come unto me*, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light." "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (Matt. 11: 27–30; 28: 18–20.)

II. PAUL.—"But you are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now *if* any man have *not the Spirit of Christ*, he is none of his." "For as many as are *led by the Spirit of God*, they are the sons of God. For *ye* have *not* received the *spirit of bondage again to fear;* but *ye* have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby *we* cry, Abba, Father. The *Spirit itself* beareth witness with *our spirit*, that *we* are the children of God." "Seeing then that *we* have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let *us* hold fast *our* profession. For *we* have *not* a *high priest* which *cannot be touched* with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." "Having therefore, brethren, *boldness to enter into the holiest* by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a high priest over the house of God; let *us* draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having *our hearts* sprinkled from an evil conscience, and *our* bodies washed with pure water." "For *ye* are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness,

and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice they that heard, entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more: but *ye are come* unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. To the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the *new covenant*, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." (Rom. 8: 9, 14, 15, 16; Heb. 4: 14–16; 10: 19–22; 12: 18, 19, 22–24.)

I hope not to be tedious to the reader by my lengthy quotations. But fearing the real point under consideration may be overlooked, I will again say, Remember that I am proving that all can know the Lord for themselves now, under the *new covenant;* and not simply through an earthly priest, as it was under the first covenant; and the only way to get rid of sins, to have them carried into the wilderness on the head of a "live goat." No! now, under the new covenant, all can know for themselves whether they are the children of God or not. Hear, then, the THIRD witness, JOHN:

"And hereby *we know* that *we* are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him. For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. Beloved, *if our heart condemn us not*, then have we confidence toward God. And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight. And this is his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one an other, as he gave us commandment. And he that keepeth his

commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby *we know* that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us." "Hereby *know we* that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit." (1 John 3: 19–24; 4: 13.)

But my objector continues and says, "There is another point which has not been taken up yet, which is mentioned in the new covenant, and I don't believe it can be reconciled with your view of the subject. It is: *And their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more;* and this cannot take place in this world, surely." We will let the word of the Lord settle this objection also: "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year." This shows that, under the first covenant it was impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin; therefore, there was a remembrance made of them again every year. (Heb. 10: 3, 4.) But, it is not so now under the new covenant, as the following Scripture will prove:

"For by *one offering* he hath *perfected forever* them that *are sanctified.*" "And *their* sins and iniquities will I remember *no more.* Now where remission of these is, there is *no more* offering for sin." (Heb. 10: 14, 17, 18.)

But my closing argument, in favor of the "new covenant" now being in force, is this: *Christ is now mediator of the new covenant,* as is clearly demonstrated by the following Scripture:

"But *now* hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he IS the *mediator* of a *better covenant,* which was established upon better promises." "And for this cause he IS the *mediator* of the *new testament,* that by means of death, for

the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." (Heb. 8: 6; 9: 15.)

The words just quoted, prove beyond all cavil that we are now living under the new covenant, which is "written in fleshly tables of the heart," and "*all*" can approach unto God, through the LIVING JESUS, as their mediator.

But to bring this argument to a close, which relates to a change of covenant—of priesthood—yea, of all things, at the time of Christ's first advent, I will present a few texts to show that Christ was *lawgiver, prophet, chief corner-stone*, etc. It was therefore his right to make this change. But first I will present one text to prove that *all things are become new;* and it will, also, fix the point of time when this change took place:

"And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again. Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." (2 Cor. 5: 15–17.)

Mark this: Jesus died and rose again; wherefore, from henceforth, know we no man after the flesh: therefore from this point "old things are passed away; behold, *all things are become new.*"

A few texts now to prove that our LIVING JESUS

was and *is* a being of great authority and power; and also a prophet, the greatest of all prophets, and chief corner-stone, etc. On this point I will introduce three witnesses: Jesus, Peter, and Paul. At the commencement of his ministry JESUS says:

"Therefore whosoever heareth *these sayings of mine* and *doeth them*, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock." "And every one that heareth *these sayings of mine*, and doeth them *not*, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand." "And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended *these sayings*, the people were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one *having authority*, and not as the scribes." (Matt. 7: 24, 26, 29.)

Again, he said, *after* his resurrection:

"*All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.*" (Matt. 28: 18.)

Second witness, PETER:

"For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, *like unto me; him shall ye hear in* ALL THINGS, whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that *every soul* which *will not hear that prophet* shall be *destroyed* from among the people." "Then Peter, filled with the Holy Spirit said unto them, Ye rulers of the people, and elders of Israel, if we this day be examined of the good deed done to the impotent man, by what means he is made whole; be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand before you whole. * * * *This was the stone* which was set at nought of you builders, which *is become the head of the corner*. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is *none other name under heaven* given among

men whereby *we must be saved.*" (Acts 3: 22, 23; 4: 8, 12.)

Third witness, PAUL:

"For HE *is our peace*, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the *foundation* of the *apostles* and *prophets*, JESUS CHRIST *himself being the* CHIEF CORNER-STONE. * * * God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed *heir of all things*, by whom also he *made the worlds;* who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and *upholding all things by the word of his power*, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. * * * By so much was JESUS *made a surety of a better testament.* And they truly were many priests because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but *this man*, because he *continueth ever* hath an *unchangeable priesthood.* Wherefore *he is able* also to *save* them to the *uttermost* that come unto God by him, seeing *he ever liveth* to make intercession for them. For such a high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and *made higher than the heavens;* who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered

up himself. For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the *word of the oath*, which was *since the law*, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore." (Eph. 2: 14–20; Heb. 1: 1–4; 7: 22–28.)

Who can doubt for one moment, after thoroughly studying the truths contained in the foregoing portions of Scripture from the New Testament, that there was an ENTIRE CHANGE in the SYSTEM OF DIVINE WORSHIP at the first advent of our Savior, or, as has been shown above, that "old things are passed away; behold, *all things are become new;*" even *a new day for the Sabbath.*

THE FIRST-DAY SABBATH.

This brings me once more to speak on the subject of the first day of the week as the Sabbath. I have already referred to the fact that neither of the apostles ever attended another seventh-day meeting after the one mentioned in Acts 18: 4. And I will now add, that this is the last time the word Sabbath is found in our version of the New Testament, except in Colossians 2: 16; and no Sabbatarian will admit for one moment that this refers to the seventh-day Sabbath. Hence, it is proved that, when Paul said, "*From* HENCEFORTH *I will go unto the Gentiles*" (Acts 18: 4–6), he did do it; and after this, there is an *entire silence* in the New Testament in regard to the seventh-day Sabbath as a day of worship. The disciples held their meetings on the "first day of the week," as the following will prove:

"And upon the *first day of the week*, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow." (Acts 20: 7.) "Upon the *first day of the week* let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." (1 Cor. 16: 2.) "I was in the spirit on the *Lord's day*." (Rev. 1: 10.)

What was the practice of the early Christians in regard to the Sabbath? The following unanswerable testimony is here presented in proof that the first day of the week was observed by the early Christians as the Sabbath, or Lord's day:

Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, A. D. 101, who died only about half a dozen years after the death of the apostle John, speaks of the LORD'S DAY familiarly and without explanations, as if everybody understood it. And he gives this title to the first day of the week exactly after the manner of the apostle himself. "Let us [Christians] no more sabbatize," he says (that is, keep the seventh day, as the Jews did), "but let us keep the LORD'S DAY." Again: "Let every one that loves Christ keep holy the LORD'S DAY, the queen of days, the resurrection day, the highest of all days."

Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, about A. D. 162, says: "Both custom and reason challenge from us that we should honor the LORD'S DAY, seeing on that day it was that our Lord Jesus completed his resurrection from the dead."

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, a disciple of Polycarp, who had been the companion of the apostles, A. D.

167, says: "On the LORD'S DAY every one of us Christians keep the Sabbath, meditating on the law, and rejoicing in the works of God."

Tertullian, who died A. D. 245, says: "The LORD'S DAY is the holy day of the Christian Church. We have nothing to do with the Sabbath (that is, the Jewish Sabbath). The LORD'S DAY is the Christian's solemnity."

Barnabas, who, if not a companion of the apostles, lived in the apostolic age, says: "We [Christians] keep the eighth day [that is, the first day of the week] as a joyful holy day, on which day also Jesus arose from the dead."

Athanasius, who died A. D. 326, says: "The Lord transferred the Sabbath to the LORD'S DAY."

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, who died A. D. 397, says: "The LORD'S DAY is sacred, or consecrated, by the resurrection of Christ."

Augustine, who died A. D. 430, says: "The LORD'S DAY was by the resurrection declared to Christians; and from that very time it began to be celebrated as the Christian festival."

The persecutors of these Christians were accustomed to put to them this question: "*Dominicum servasti?*" Hast thou kept the LORD'S DAY? If they had, they were marked as Christians. This was the badge of their Christianity. And if they said they had, and would not recant, they must be put to death. And when they continued steadfast, what was their

answer? "*Christianus sum; intermittere non possum.*" I am a Christian; I cannot omit it. It is a badge of my religion, and the man who assumes it must of course keep the LORD'S DAY, because it is the will of his Lord; and should he abandon it, he would be an apostate from his religion."

Eusebius, "one of the most learned and eloquent men of the Christian Church," called the "Father of Ecclesiastical History," who died about A. D. 339, in his Commentary on the Psalms, says of Psalm 92: "The Word [Christ] by the new covenant, translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the true rest, viz.: the saving LORD'S DAY; the first [day] of the light, in which the Savior of the world, after all his labors among men, obtained the victory over death. * * * On this day, which is the first of light and of the true Sun, we assemble, after an interval of six days, and celebrate holy and spiritual Sabbaths—even all nations redeemed by him throughout the world—and do those things, according to the spiritual law, which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath; for we make spiritual offerings and sacrifices, which are called sacrifices of praise and rejoicing."

Theodoret, another Ecclesiastical Historian, who died about A. D. 460, speaking of the Ebionites, a party of Judaizing Christians, says: "They keep the Sabbath according to the Jewish law, and sanctify the LORD'S DAY in like manner as we do." (Hæret.

Fab. 2. 1.) "This," says Prof. Stewart, "gives a good historical view of the state of things in the early ages of the Church. The zealots for the law wished the Jewish Sabbath to be observed as well as the LORD'S DAY; for about the latter there appears never to have been any question among any class of Christians, so far as I have been able to discover. The early Christians, one and all of them, held the first day of the week to be sacred." (Sabbath Manual, No. 2, pp. 111, 126.)

Says Mosheim: "All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the *first day of the week* on which the triumphant Savior arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the Church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the *express appointment of the apostles*, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout all the Christian Churches, as appears from the united testimony of the most credible writers." (Maclaine's Mosheim, Cent. 1, part II., c. 4, s. 4.)

Enough of such testimony has been presented to prove that two days were observed by the early Christians. The "party of Judaizing Christians" kept the *seventh* day. Those who followed Christ and the apostles kept the *first day*. And thus it has been and *is now;* those who followed the Jews, or the teaching of the dead "schoolmaster," will of course contend for the seventh-day Sabbath! But those

who *have* followed, and *still do* follow, the teachings of the LIVING JESUS and the APOSTLES, will observe the first-day Sabbath.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

The first is founded on Matthew 24: 20: "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath-day." The Sabbatarian contends that by this passage the Savior recognized the sacredness of the seventh-day Sabbath, up to this time, surely. But we shall see. Two distinct things Jesus told the disciples to pray for. This is plain. All, I presume, understand that Christ had told the disciples that Jerusalem was to be destroyed by the Roman army; and when they—the disciples—should "see Jerusalem compassed with armies," then they must "flee to the mountains." But, in doing so, they were liable to meet with two obstacles, and only two. Therefore they must pray. Pray for what? Pray that your "flight be not in the winter, neither on the SABBATH-DAY." If their flight should happen in the winter, it would be difficult for the disciples, with their families, to live in "the mountains." If their flight should happen on the Sabbath-day, they would find it extremely difficult to "flee" out of Jerusalem, as the gates would be closed according to Jewish law and custom. (Ex. 16: 23; Neh. 13: 13–22.) This being the case, Jesus knew well that those who were

so tenacious of their traditions of the Sabbath as to lead them to condemn him as a *Sabbath-breaker* for restoring the withered hand, so that it was made "whole like as the other," and for making a woman straight whom Satan had bound and bent over, or bowed together, so that she could in no wise lift up herself for eighteen years, for performing these acts of mercy on the Sabbath; I say, Jesus knew well that such hypocrites would be a great hindrance to the disciples if their flight should take place on the Sabbath. Now consider: Christ had told the disciples to leave Jerusalem when they should see it compassed with armies. Was Christ Lord also of the Sabbath? So he had once said. Why, then, should he direct his disciples to pray that their flight might *not* occur on the Sabbath-day? The just inference is this: Christ really being "Lord of the Sabbath," the disciples would have a perfect right to leave Jerusalem at any time when Christ told them to. And therefore, if the Jews would not let them leave, when Christ had ordered it, it proves that those ~~sad~~ hypocrites had so monopolized all the privileges of that day by their *traditions*, that even the disciples could not obey the Lord Jesus without praying to God to prevent them from falling into the hands of such wicked men, who were so outrageously bigoted in regard to the Sabbath, that they would neither let Christ or his followers do that which was *right* on that day. Hence the Sabbatarian finds nothing here to prove a sacred

regard for the seventh-day Sabbath, *but a wicked perversion of all its rights*, by a class of men who were enemies to God and violent opposers of his people.

The *second* objection is, "THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE." What is this third angel's message? Why, a late theory has been started, which claims that Revelation 14: 12 has special reference to a particular class of persons who believe in keeping "the commandments of God," as mentioned in this verse; and that these commandments have special reference to the *"seventh-day Sabbath."* The passage reads: "Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." It will be seen by the passage itself that it refers to the "commandments of God"—all of them—and not to any particular one. How, then, shall we determine what commandments are referred to? Please notice the last clause in the verse, *the faith of Jesus*. This proves that the commandments referred to are those of the New Testament; for there was no "faith of Jesus" before Christ came the first time. Be not alarmed, kind reader; this will be proved by the word of truth, an unerring guide. Hear:

"But *before faith came*, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterward be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But AFTER *that faith is come*, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." (Gal. 3: 23–25.)

The following quotations will give us an idea of the "commandments" referred to:

"He that hath *my commandments* and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me. * * * If ye keep *my commandments*, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you *are the commandments of the Lord.*" (John 14: 21; 15: 10; 1 Cor. 14: 37.)

No one need be surprised to see men, and women too, run into error when they will keep themselves "shut up unto the faith," but never come to it! Why will men be so blinded as to have faith in the "*visions*" *of a woman* instead of the visions of John? Why follow the teachings of *the old dead "schoolmaster,"* instead of following the LIVING JESUS? They thus give countenance to the system for taking away sins on the "head" of a "live goat!" I would exhort all such to "BEHOLD THE LAMB OF GOD, WHICH TAKETH AWAY THE SIN OF THE WORLD." (John 1: 29.)

CHAPTER IV.

"MINISTRATION OF DEATH"—"MINISTRATION OF THE SPIRIT."

What does *ministration* mean, as found in 2 Cor. 3: 7, 8? Does it mean *dispensation?* So it is rendered in the *Emphatic Diaglott.* What does dispensation mean? Webster defines it thus:

"4. * * * A system of principles and rights enjoined: as, the *Mosaic dispensation;* the *Gospel dispensation;* including, the former, the Levitical law and rites; the latter, the scheme of redemption by Christ."

This word ministration, or dispensation, is from the Greek *diakonia,* meaning service, etc. The idea, then, of this matter appears to be this: The great constitution, or the organic law of the *Mosaic* dispensation, was "written on stones," and is "done away:" but the superior constitution, or organic law of the *Gospel* dispensation, is written with the "Spirit of the living God; *not* in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the HEART."

The *first,* or Mosaic dispensation, was a dispensation of "DEATH;" because death, physical and im-

mediate death, inflicted by man was the penalty for the violation of any one, or of all of "the ten commandments," or articles of the first, or Mosaic constitution.

The *second*, or gospel dispensation, is a dispensation of the "SPIRIT;" because it is a dispensation of mercy and grace; and the penalty for a violation of any one, or of all of the commandments, or articles in this second or gospel constitution, is to be "the second death"—inflicted by the Lord himself, when the day of probation is passed—when even those who suffered physical death, for a violation of the law during the dispensation of "death," must, at the resurtion of the wicked, be "cast into the lake of fire," with all others who may have lived and died sinners, during the entire period of man's probation.

Here I repeat what I have before said. The reason why the organic law, or ten commandments of the dispensation of *Death*, is "done away," is because the *penalty of physical death is done away*. To illustrate: Suppose a state or nation at any time should pass a law against *ten particular, criminal acts*, the penalty for a violation of either, to be death by hanging by the neck until they were dead. Then, after a series of years, this same state or nation, being differently situated, finally pass another law against the *same particular criminal acts*, making the penalty for the violation of either, imprisonment for life instead of death by hanging, would not

the first law be repealed? Surely it would. But still there would be *a* law against the *same ten criminal acts;* but the old law, or dispensation, would be "done away." So in the case now under consideration. The old law of the Decalogue, which existed during the dispensation of *death*, is "done away," because the *penalty has been changed.* But still there is a *new law* against the same ten criminal acts; and this law is written "on fleshly tables of the heart;" but the penalty for a violation of *this law* will be inflicted by the righteous Judge, at the final retribution of ungodly men.

But says the objector, There is *no law written in the heart!* Please hold a moment; let the apostle Paul speak: "This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them." (Heb. 10: 16.) Here the "Holy Spirit" says that the Lord will put his "LAWS INTO THEIR HEARTS, and in their *minds will I write them.*" And let the objector take notice that this is under the "new covenant." And all reasonable minds must acknowledge that the "Holy Spirit" is a competent "*witness to us.*" (Heb. 10: 15.)

What says the Spirit? "THE LETTER KILLETH." Is it not strange, then, that any one living in the dispensation of the "Spirit" should ask for a law written with "*ink*," to direct them which *day* is to be kept for the Sabbath? The law, which points out

the day for us to observe as the Sabbath, is "WRITTEN NOT WITH INK" (2 Cor. 3: 3), but with the "SPIRIT OF THE LIVING GOD—IN THE HEART." Why, then, look for a direct law written in the New Testament for keeping the Sabbath? That law written with "ink" is "done away"—it is "DEAD." The law written with "ink" relates to the "seventh day;" but that law which is written in the heart relates to the "first day of the week," *Sabbaton.*

Remember: "The letter killeth." The penalty of that law which has been written with ink was *death*—the transgressors of that law were to be *stoned to death.* This shows why we have no *particular code of laws written with ink,* in the New Testament (as were written in the Old Testament) for keeping the Sabbath. The law for keeping the Christian Sabbath—"the first day of the week," or "LORD'S DAY," is written by the Spirit "in the heart." Hence, we can see what harmony there was with the apostles and early Christians, as shown by their practice, in keeping "the first day of the week." They needed no precept directly written with ink; neither do we. Their *example* is enough for us.

But let us prove that the Gospel dispensation is a dispensation of the "Spirit." It so begins. Christ was begotten by the Holy Spirit. (Matt. 1: 18, 20.)*

*In treating upon this topic, I shall use the term "Spirit," instead of "Ghost," for this word is invariably from the Greek *pneuma,* and should be rendered *Spirit.* The term "Ghost" is a little too much like *ghostly* Roman Catholicism for the use of Protestants.

Christ was not only begotten by the Spirit, but the Father put his Spirit upon him, that he might "show judgment to the Gentiles." (Matt. 12: 18.) Christ also *cast out demons* by the Spirit. (Matt. 12: 28.) The Spirit anointed Christ to "preach the Gospel." (Lk. 4: 18.) "The Spirit" raised up Christ from the dead." (Rom. 8: 11.)

CHRISTIANITY IS WHOLLY DEPENDENT UPON THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Christians are born of the Spirit (John 3: 6, 8); Christians must worship God in the Spirit (John 4: 23, 24; Phil. 3: 3); Christians must serve God "in newness of Spirit." (Rom. 7: 6.) It is the Spirit that teaches the saints how to pray. (Rom. 8: 26, 27.) Christians must be led by the Spirit. (Rom. 8: 14.) The Spirit was to direct the apostles what to say when brought before rulers and kings for Christ's sake. (Lk. 12: 12.) The apostles were called and sent forth by the Spirit to preach the Gospel. (Acts 20: 28; 13: 4; 1 Thess. 1: 5.) The apostles were particularly aided by the Spirit in preaching the Gospel, (1 Pet. 1: 12; Rom. 15: 19; Acts 16: 6, 7.) The Spirit directed the apostles how to *set things in order* in the Churches. (Acts 15: 28.) The Spirit gave COMMANDMENTS unto the apostles. (Acts 1: 2.) If the apostles or early Christians were *lacking in their faith* (1 Thess. 3: 5), or in doubt of anything, the *Spirit searched out all things* for them. (1 Cor.

2: 10, 11, 13.) No one can say *"that Jesus is the Lord,"* but by the Holy *Spirit.* (1 Cor. 12: 3.) The "diversities of gifts" were all by the same Spirit. (1 Cor. 12: 4.) "The manifestations of the Spirit" were "given to every man to profit withal," whether in "wisdom," "knowledge," "faith," "gifts of healing," "working of miracles," "prophecy," "discerning of spirits," "divers kinds of tongues," "interpretation of tongues," all these were by the *"self-same* SPIRIT." (1 Cor. 12: 7–11.) By the Spirit "the seven Churches" were taught the *truth.* (Rev. 2: 7, 11, 17, 29; 3: 6, 13, 22.) The Holy Spirit is a witness to the saints. (Rom. 8: 16; Heb. 10: 15.) There is a *"law of the* SPIRIT *of life."* (Rom. 8: 2, 10.) What will *this law* do for the Christian? It will make him *"free from the law* of sin and death." (Rom. 8: 2.) That "which in *other ages* was not made known unto the sons of men," is "NOW REVEALED" unto the saints "BY THE SPIRIT." (Eph. 3: 5.) This is why John could call "the first day of the week" "THE LORD'S DAY." He was *"in the* SPIRIT." (Rev. 1: 10.)

Let us here call to mind that Christ once said to his disciples: "I have *yet many things* to say unto you, but ye CANNOT BEAR THEM NOW." (John 16: 12.) When could they bear them? He adds: "When he, the *Spirit* of truth is come, he will guide you into ALL TRUTH." This proves that there were some things which could not be known by even the apostles themselves until the Holy *Spirit* should come as a

teacher, *superior to Christ himself.* For he said, "I tell you the truth; it is *expedient for you* that *I* go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." (v. 7.) And when that "SPIRIT OF TRUTH" should come, that should guide into ALL TRUTH, he would show them "*things to come.*" Let us, then, ever bear in mind, that the way we are to obtain the truth, in the "dispensation of the Spirit," is by "THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH." Cannot we obtain the truth except through the *Spirit?* (John 14: 17.) "The Spirit of truth * * * the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him." But to the *Christian* this Spirit of truth was to teach all things, and always in harmony with Christ's words which he had taught, as we learn by John 14: 26: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." When would the apostles be fully prepared to be "witnesses" for Christ and his gospel, "in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth?" Not until the Holy *Spirit* came upon them (Acts 1: 8): then they could speak "AS THE SPIRIT *gave them utterance.*" (Acts 2: 4.) This proves that they were not governed by the "*letter*" of the law written with "*ink.*" Those, then, it would appear, who are determined to be governed by the "letter" instead of

the "*Spirit*," are trying to worry themselves through an *imaginary* dispensation of death, and are thus not only treading "under foot the Son of God," but they are doing "DESPITE TO THE SPIRIT OF GRACE!" (Heb. 10: 29.)

But, says the Sabbatarian, I will not believe the day has been changed for the Sabbath, from the seventh to the first day of the week, unless I can see the plain command for it *written with ink! Judaism* always did, and always *must*, walk by "*sight*," by the "*letter*," written with "*ink*," or "on tables of *stone*." But Christianity walks by "faith," knowing that the law by which the Christian is governed is not written "with ink," neither "in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart," and this by the "SPIRIT OF THE LIVING God." (2 Cor. 3: 3.)

INFLUENCE OF JUDAISM.

The apostles, and early Christians, could no more get rid of the influence of the old Jewish seventh-day Sabbath all at once, than they could that of circumcision. Paul "took and circumcised" Timothy (Acts 16: 1–3), "*because* of the *Jews* which were in those quarters." Again, when Paul saw "how many thousands of *Jews*" (Acts 21: 20–26) there were "which believed," and yet "*all zealous of the law*;" he, with "four men" which had "a vow on them," "entered into the temple," "until an offering should be offered

for every one of them." And thus did Paul *Judaize* for nearly "seven days." But why did Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, do this? Let him answer: "For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the *Jews* I became *as a Jew*, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the *law, as under the law*, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the *law to Christ*), that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men that I might by all means save some." (1 Cor. 9: 19–22.) And thus "being crafty," he "caught them with guile." (2 Cor. 12: 16.)

THE STATE OF THE WORLD WHEN CHRISTIANITY APPEARED.

Says D'Aubigne (vol. I., p. 33):

"The enfeebled world was tottering on its foundations when Christianity appeared. The national religions which had satisfied the parents no longer proved sufficient for their children. The new generations could not repose contented within the ancient forms."

Says Milman (pp. 158–9):

"As an universal religion, aspiring to the complete moral conquest of the world, Christianity had to encounter three antag-

onists: Judaism, Paganism, and Orientalism. * * * With *Judaism*, Christianity had to maintain a double conflict: one external, with Judaism of the temple, the Synagogue, the Sanhedrim; * * * the other, more dangerous and destructive, the Judaism of the infant Church; the old prejudices and opinions which even Christianity could not altogether extirpate or correct in the early Jewish proselytes; the perpetual tendency to contract again the expanding circle; the enslavement of Christianity to the provisions of the Mosaic law, and the spirit of the antiquated religion of Palestine. * * * The same measures rendered the internal conflict with the lingering Judaism within the Church more violent and desperate. Its dying struggles, as it were, to maintain its ground, rent for some time the infant community with civil divisions. But the predominant influx of Gentile converts gradually obtained the ascendancy; *Judaism slowly died out* in the great body of the Church, and the Judæo-Christian sects in the East languished, and at length expired in obscurity."

Again, the following great truth brought out by D'Aubigne in what he said in regard to the Reformation under Luther, will most strikingly apply to the Reformation under Christ, the apostles, and early Christians:

"If Luther had begun by an external reform; if, as soon as he had spoken, he had attempted to abolish monastic vows, the mass, confession, and forms of worship, most assuredly he would have met with a vigorous resistance. Man requires time to accomodate himself to great revolutions."

WHEN DID THE CHANGE TAKE PLACE FROM THE SEVENTH TO THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK?

This question is of importance. Those who reject

the first day, do so on the ground that they claim there is no evidence in the Scriptures that any such change ever took place with God's sanction. It is said, If the Lord ever intended such change, Christ and the apostles would have plainly and positively taught this doctrine from the first. But a little reflection will teach any one that *not even Christ or the apostles could preach the whole truth from the beginning.* The Father did not so arrange it. Christ himself was not to teach even the apostles the whole truth while he was in this world with them; for he said, "It is expedient for you that I go away;" for it is "the *Spirit*" which is to "guide you into all truth;" and "if I go not away, the Comforter, or Spirit, will not come to you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you;" and "he will show you things to come." (John 16: 7–13.) Let us remember that

CHRIST'S MINISTRY WAS RESTRICTED TO THE JEWISH NATION.

The writer of the Acts of the Apostles sums up the whole in ~~two~~ words: "*He* DID *and* TAUGHT." (Acts 1: 1.) But what were some of the obstacles in the way of Christ and the apostles in the introduction of the "Dispensation of the Spirit?" Jones says:

"If we keep in view these false principles by which the minds of the Jewish people were led astray, the invincible obstinacy of their prejudices, and the contrariety of the doctrine and char-

acter of Jesus thereto, we shall cease to wonder at the issue to which matters were ultimately reduced between them. When he avowed himself to be the Son of God, and claimed equality with the Most High, they resisted his pretensions, and accused him of blasphemy. * * * The Sadducees, it would seem, had, at this time, the chief sway in the Jewish state. Josephus, their own historian, has described them 'as remarkable for a fierce and cruel temper; and that, particularly when they sat in judgment, they were much more rigorous and severe than the Pharisees.' * * * Herod was a professed zealot for the law of Moses and the peculiarities of Judaism, and studied by every means in his power to ingratiate himself with the Jews." (Hist., pp. 40, 46, 54.)

And the apostle Paul, following the example of Christ, continued at times to conform to Jewish customs, knowing that in a short time there would be a full end made to the Jewish polity. This fact is clearly set forth by Mr. Jones in the following language:

"He [Paul] well knew that the time which God had appointed for putting an end to the political constitution of the Jews had not yet arrived. He, therefore, conformed to the rites of Judaism himself, though aware that the whole of that typical dispensation had been *virtually* abolished by the death of Christ; and he instructed his Jewish brethren to do the same, until, by the destruction of the temple and city, the providence of God should co-operate with his word in rendering it impossible for them any longer to adhere to Moses." (Hist., p. 72.)

Then in speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, he says:

"On the seventeenth day of that month [July] the daily sacrifice for the *first time* ceased, there being no proper person re-

maining to offer them up. * * * We may also remark, that by these terrible events an end was at length put to the Mosaic economy; for, with the destruction of their city and temple, the whole of the Jewish polity and Church state was also subverted." (pp. 90, 93.)

Heylyn also says:

"The *Jews* were very much affected to their ancient ceremonies; and Calvin rightly hath affirmed that a full reformation of that zeal of theirs, as it was full of difficulty, so could it not be done upon the sudden. Therefore, it pleased the apostles, as it is conceived in their fourth Council holden at Jerusalem, mention whereof is made in Acts 21 [see v. 25], to make it lawful for the Jews to retain circumcision and such legal rites, together with the faith of Christ; as long as the Jewish Temple, and the legal sacrifices in Jerusalem, should continue standing. Not that the faith of Christ was not sufficient of itself for their salvation; but that the synagogue might be laid to sleep with the greater honors." (p. 408.)

Now, as the subject of the Sabbath made as much trouble between Christ and the Jews as any one thing, it is evident that a complete change of days for the Sabbath could not be brought round all at once. Before the apostles could be taught the *whole truth*, the "SPIRIT OF TRUTH" must come; and that could not take place until Christ should go to his Father. (John 16: 7, 12, 13.) Hence it was the *Spirit* which gave "COMMANDMENTS unto the apostles." (Acts 1: 2.)

WHY DID PAUL VISIT THE JEWISH SYNAGOGUES ON THEIR SABBATH?

The answer, in short, may be found in 1 Corinth-

ians 9: 20. But let us examine Paul's history in regard to this matter. First, however, we will listen to a few words from Neander, the distinguished Church historian. He says:

"Let us recollect that the faith in Jesus as the promised Messiah was the fundamental doctrine on which the whole structure of the Church arose. Accordingly, the first Christian community was formed of very heterogeneous materials. It was composed of such as differed from other Jews only by the acknowledging of Jesus as the Messiah—of such as still continued bound to the same contracted Jewish notions which they had entertained before; and of such as, by coming to know Jesus more and more as the Messiah in the higher spiritual sense, by surrendering themselves with docility to the Spirit of Christ, would, by the inworking of that Spirit, be ever growing in their Christian knowledge, and becoming more completely freed from their besetting errors. * * * The sifting process of history must effect a separation between those who had really been brought into contact with the spirit of Christianity and those who still belonged more truly to Judaism. To this necessary separation in the course of history, the words of Paul (1 Cor. 11: 19, and of 1 John 2: 13) properly apply. As Christ himself had faithfully observed the Mosaic law, so the faithful observance of it was adhered to *at first* by all believers. * * * That which Christ intended, when he said that he was not come to destroy the law but to fulfill it, and when he called himself the Lord of the Sabbath; that which he meant by the worship of God, confined no longer to particular times or places, but in spirit and in truth, the essence of the new spiritual creation, which is grounded in the resurrection of Christ, was clearly conceived and expressed by the apostle Paul, and a *self-subsisting Christian Church, wholly independent of Judaism, formed among the Pagans.* Already a schism threatened to break out

between the two elements of which the Christian Church was composed—the prevailing notion of Christianity in Palestine, which was characterized by a decided leaning to the Old Testament, and which suffered the new spirit to remain enveloped in the old forms of Judaism; and the independent Pauline development of Christianity among the Pagans." (Vol. I. [Torry], pp. 41, 42.)

Coleman, in his *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, says:

"In the synagogue worship the followers of Christ found a most congenial institution. It invited them to the reading of the Scriptures and to prayer. It gave them liberty of speech in exhortation and in worshiping and praising God. The rules and government of the synagogue, while they offered little, comparatively, to excite the pride of office and of power, commended themselves the more to the humble believer in Christ. The synagogue was endeared to the devout Jew by sacred associations and tender recollections. It was near at hand, and not, like the temple, afar off. He went but seldom up to Jerusalem, and only on great occasions joined in the rites of the temple service. But in the synagogue he paid his constant devotions to the God of his fathers. It met his eye in every place. It was constantly before him; and from infancy to hoary age, he was accustomed to repair to that hallowed place of worship, to listen to the reading of his sacred books, to pray, and sing praises unto the God of Israel." (pp. 34, 35.)

In speaking of Jewish synagogues, Morer says:

"There were in Jerusalem besides the temple, no less than 460, as Rabbi Phinehas reckons 'em, though others say 480 and 481. * * * Now the *use* they put their *synagogues* to, is partly discovered from the two apartments they give 'em. The *one* was the room for Canonical Scriptures, where the law and the prophets were kept and read; the *other*, the room of tradi-

tions, where the sayings of the Fathers were expounded and taught the people. See Acts 15: 21." (pp. 249–50.)

PAUL IN THE SYNAGOGUES.

Now, in the light of the foregoing, and also of the Scriptures, we will examine Paul's history in regard to visiting the Jewish synagogues. *Christ* taught the *Jews* in their synagogues and in the temple (John 18: 20); but he taught the "multitudes" from the "mountain," the "ship," or in whatever place they were assembled. So with *Paul:* he taught the *Jews* in their synagogues. And what did he preach to them at Damascus? "He preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God." What effect did it have on them? He "confounded the *Jews* which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is very Christ." This was *not* preaching the seventh-day Sabbath; for "the *Jews* took counsel to kill him." "And they watched the gates day and night to kill him." (Acts 9: 20–24.) At Antioch, Paul goes into the synagogue on the Sabbath, and sat down. After reading the law and the prophets by the rulers of the synagogue, they invited the apostle to exhort the people, when he stood up and began his speech by going back in the history of the Jewish people, to the time their "fathers" "dwelt as strangers in the land of Egypt." He then brings them down through their own history, replete with knowledge and understanding of their Scriptures, until he came to their

own time, when he makes a personal application to them, and their nation, of events relating to the crucifixion of Christ, in the following language:

"Men and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and whosoever among you feareth God, to you is the word of this salvation sent. For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath-day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him. And though they found no cause of death in him, yet desired they Pilate that he should be slain. And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree, and laid him in a sepulchre. But God raised him from the dead. And he was seen many days of them which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people. And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David. * * * Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses. Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets; behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish: for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you." (Acts 13: 26–42.)

The "Jews" were inclined to go "out of the synagogue," without inviting the apostle to attend another meeting with *them*: but the Gentiles invited Paul

to preach to them the same words "the next Sabbath" —or as the margin reads (a critical Greek rendering) —"*in the week between*, or *in the Sabbath between*." What does this mean? "THE SABBATH BETWEEN." Between what? Why, between two Jewish Sabbaths. Hence, we have the proof of the *first-day* Christian Sabbath, as no other Sabbath, strictly so called, could come "between" two Jewish seventh-day Sabbaths. In proof of this position, we will here introduce a criticism on this text by the celebrated Thos. Morer, found in his work, *On the Sabbath*, published in London, 1701. On p. 191 he says:

"However, that it was done with great *caution* and some *concern*, we find by the matter of the request; which was, that the apostles would preach to 'em *some day* BETWEEN *this and the next Sabbath*, for that is the strict translation of the Greek, *some time* BETWEEN *the Sabbaths*, suppose the next day, or the day after; all which days among the Jews were called Sabbath, as well as the day on which they worshiped. Which not only expounds the verse, but may be the sense of the forty-fourth, that *almost the whole city the next Sabbath; i. e.*, the day following, *came together to hear the Word of God*. And this might well cause so much envy in the *Jews* (v. 45), not only because vast companies came to hear the apostles preach, but because it was *on such days* as brought some disrespect to *their famous Sabbath*, on which, and no other day of the week, they would have such meetings to be held."

This criticism by Morer is of great importance. To prove he is right, we will give the following. The Greek word in Acts 13: 42, rendered *next*, is *metaxu*. This word occurs *nine* times in the New Testament.

We will give them all, and then the reader can see for himself how this word is used:

Matthew 18: 15—"Tell him his fault *between* thee and him alone."

Matthew 23: 35—"*Between* the temple and the altar."

Luke 11: 51—"*Between* the altar and the temple."

Luke 16: 26—"*Between* us and you there is a great gulf."

John 4: 31—"In the *meanwhile* his disciples."

Acts 12: 6—"Sleeping *between* two soldiers."

Acts 13: 42—"He preached to them the *next* Sabbath."

Acts 15: 9—"No difference *between* us and them."

Romans 2: 15—"And [their] thoughts the *meanwhile* accusing."

Parkhurst defines *metaxu:* "1. *Between.* Matt. 18: 15; 23: 35; Rom. 2: 15."

Robinson: "Adv. and prep. *in the midst, between.*"

Tyndale: "When they were come out of the synagogue of the Jews, the Gentiles besought that they would preach the Word to them *between the Sabbath-days.*"

Wesley: And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought them, that these words might be spoken to them on *the Sabbath between.*"

Coverdale: "When the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the heathen besought them, that they would speak the Word unto them *between the Sabbath-days.*"

Thompson: "And on their going out of the synagogue of the Jews, the Gentiles entreated that these things might be spoken to them, *in the interim*—till the next Sabbath."

Sharpe: "And when they were gone out, they begged that these words might be preached to them in the *week between.*"

Whitby: "In the *week between*—or in the Sabbath between."

In v. 43 it reads: "Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious pros-

elytes followed Paul and Barnabas; who speaking to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God." And so, on "the next Sabbath-day"—the next *first* day, if the above criticisms are correct—came almost the whole city together to hear the Word of God. How did the *Jews* feel in view of such a meeting as this? Why, when they "saw the *multitudes*, they were filled with ENVY, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming." If the Sabbatarian does not agree with the above criticisms, that the "Sabbath between" was the first day of the week, he must agree with us in this: that the apostle did not preach "seventh-day" doctrine to that vast multitude; for if he did, they would not have been guilty of "contradicting" Paul, and "blaspheming" God, as they did, we think. At Iconium Paul went "into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake that a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed." But what did the "unbelieving Jews" do? Why, they "stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affected toward the brethren." And so "the multitude of the city was divided: and part held with the Jews, and part with the apostles." (Acts 14: 1–4.) What think you, reader; did Paul preach the "seventh-day" doctrine at Iconium? At Thessalonica, "where was a synagogue of the *Jews;* and, according to his CUSTOM, Paul went in to them, and on three Sabbaths reasoned with them from the

Scriptures, opening and setting forth that the Messiah ought to suffer and to rise from the dead, and that 'this is the anointed Jesus whom I announce to you.'" (*Emphatic Diaglott* on Acts 17: 1–3.)

The "custom" here spoken of was not that his habit was to meet on the seventh-day Sabbath particularly; but his "custom" was, when he did meet with the *seventh-day* JEWS, to *reason* with them from the Scriptures, and "announce" to them that "Jesus" was the "Messiah"—the ANOINTED of God. But what success did Paul meet with here? Some believed, of the "Greeks" and the "chief women." "But the *Jews* which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them out to the people. And when they found them not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down, are come hither also; whom Jason hath received: and these all do contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying, that there is another king, one Jesus." (Acts 17: 5–7.)

At this "uproar," the "brethren" became so alarmed that they "immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea: who coming thither went into the synagogue of the Jews." But we are not informed on what particular day of the week this was, whether the first, seventh, or some other day of the

week. But most likely it was not confined to the seventh day, simply to accomodate the Jews, as here in Berea they found a "more noble" class of hearers than at any other place, for "they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so." But when the *Jews* of Thessalonica heard that Paul was preaching at Berea, holding meetings "*daily*," and paying no regard to *their Sabbath*, "they came thither, also, and stirred up the people." And so the "brethren," becoming alarmed again, "immediately * * * sent away Paul to go *as it were* to the sea." But those who "conducted Paul, brought him unto Athens." But "while Paul waited at Athens, his spirit was stirred in him;" and, "therefore *disputed* he in the synagogue with the *Jews*," "and in the market *daily*." Holding his meetings, it appears, in the *synagogue* with the *seventh-day Jews;* but with others on the "*first-day*," or *daily in the market*, or wherever he could get the people together.

Next we find Paul at Corinth (Acts 18: 1–4), where "he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." But so hard, and blind, were they, that "Paul was pressed in spirit, and testified to the JEWS that Jesus was Christ." But how did these pharisaical seventh-day keepers receive this? Did Paul's reasoning and persuasion do them any good? Not at all. The result was, "they opposed themselves and blasphemed."

At this, Paul became discouraged; and "he shook his raiment and said unto them, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean: from henceforth I go to the Gentiles." Thus Paul was again compelled to leave the seventh-day Jewish synagogue, and hold his meetings in the private house of one "Justus, a worshiper of God, whose house was adjoining the synagogue." (*Emphatic Diaglott.*) Here "Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord, with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were immersed." And there, close by the seventh-day synagogue, Paul remained a "year and six months, teaching among them the Word of God." Gallio having become proconsul of Achaia, the Jews with one mind assaulted Paul, and brought him to the tribunal, saying, "This fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law." When Gallio learned that the Jews had only "a question concerning doctrine, and names, and the law" which was among them, he said, "I will be no judge of such things." And in his wrath, as he could bear with them no longer, "he drove them from the tribunal."

But Paul having had a vision, in which he was told, "Fear not, but speak, and be not silent," he "remained yet many days;" and then, "bidding farewell to the brethren," he sailed for Syria, "in company with Priscilla and Aquilla; having shaved his head in Cenchrea, for he had a vow." Here, again, we find in the apostle a little more *Judaism*. But this

is all explained in 1 Corinthians 9 : 20. Is it strange, therefore, that Paul should go into the seventh-day synagogues, occasionally, to reason with, and try to persuade his former brethren among the Jews to become Christians? If he could still practice the old Jewish rite of "shaving the head," "circumcision," etc., in order that he "might gain the Jews," of course he would visit their synagogues on their Sabbaths whenever he thought proper to do so.

Next, we find Paul at Ephesus (Acts 18 : 19–26), where he again "entered into the synagogue, and reasoned with the Jews. And when they requested him to remain a longer time, he did not consent, but bade them farewell, saying, I will return to you again, God willing." So, after some time, he returned, "and having entered the synagogue, he spake boldly for three months, reasoning and persuading about the Kingdom of God." This was quite a lengthy meeting—"*three months.*" And here let us remember, that there were as many *first days*, in these "three months," as there were seventh days. And it is quite evident that the Jews, as such, did not have control of that particular synagogue at Ephesus; for when the apostle left them at his first visit, by their special invitation, he promised to return; which proves that they were his friends, or they would not have invited him to again visit them. But it is true that some became "hardened, and disbelieved, speaking evil of the way before the people." This led

Paul to "depart from them," after having "separated the disciples, reasoning daily in the school of Tyrannus." So in the school-room of this Christian teacher, Paul could hold *daily meetings*—a privilege, probably, not often enjoyed in the seventh-day synagogues; but in Tyrannus' school-room, the apostle held a lengthy protracted meeting "for two years, so that all the inhabitants of Asia heard the Word of the Lord."

PAUL AND THE THEATER.

Paul's next attempt to speak to the people was to go into a theater. (Acts 19: 30–41.) But in this he failed, as his friends would not permit him to do it, "advising him not to venture into the theater. Some therefore said one thing, and some another; for the assembly was confused, and the greater part did not know why they were come together. And they pushed Alexander out of the crowd, the Jews thrusting him forward." When the town clerk, or recorder, finally succeeded in quieting the crowd, "he dismissed the assembly." "After the tumult was allayed, Paul, having summoned the disciples," "departed to go into Macedonia." (ch. 20: 1.) And he went into Greece, and "remained three months." But "a plot being laid for him by the Jews, as he was about to sail into Syria, he resolved to return through Macedonia." And when he was in Troas, we find Paul holding his meeting on "the FIRST day of the WEEK," in an "up-

per room," in the "*third story,*" instead of a seventh-day Jewish synagogue. Now let the reader remember that the meeting held at Troas was on the *first* day of the *week* [*Sabbaton*], and *not* on the *seventh* day of *sabbaton.* It was not a *night* [Greek, *nux*] meeting exclusively; as certain ones would have us believe, so as to make it appear that Paul "journeyed" (?) on the first day of the week. But it was a *day* [*heemeran*] meeting, commenced on the *first day* of the *week* [*Sabbaton*], and *not* the first *night.* The meeting continued through the first day, and through the second night; and thus Paul "journeyed" on the second day of the week. But, says the objector, the word *sabbaton,* rendered week, has nothing to do with this matter; and the word "day" is not found in the original, where it is rendered "first *day* of the week," in our common version.

To meet these objections, we will here introduce a criticism as found in *Both Sides,* pp. 118–19:

"It is evident that the word *sabbaton* sometimes means the whole week. How, then, shall we determine *when* it has this meaning? Easily enough. Robinson says that it has this meaning 'after numerals denoting the days of the week.' We now inquire, Does the word *sabbaton,* in those places where the expression, 'first day of the week,' occurs in the New Testament, follow a numeral adjective denoting the day of the week? We answer, Yes, *in every instance.* Then no one can deny, without discarding all authority, that in these instances *sabbaton* means week, and the translation of our common version is correct. * * * One instance will suffice for the whole, and we will take the first one, Matthew 28: 1. The words are, *mian*

sabbaton (pronounced with long o, as in tone). *Mian* is the numerical adjective meaning one, or according to a Hebraism, 'first.' It agrees with day, understood. *Sabbaton* is in the genitive plural, literally answering to the English words, 'of the week.' So we have, as plainly as language can say it, 'first day of the week.' * * * The word *mian* being in the feminine gender shows that the noun understood, with which it agrees, is a feminine noun. And there is no word which can be introduced to supply the ellipsis, except the word which the translators of our Bible have supplied, namely: *heemeran*, day, which renders the sense complete, and being a feminine noun, answers to the feminine adjective, *mian*, and makes the construction harmonious and perfect. We accordingly find in the margin of the Greek Testament, a reference from the word *mian* saying, "*heemeran* understood." And we are forced to the conclusion that Greenfield, Robinson, and Liddell and Scott, in their lexicons, and the forty-seven learned men of England who made our version of the New Testament, are correct in their translation."

"So we have, as plainly as language can say it," that Paul did hold his meeting at Troas, on "the first day of the week"—*Both Sides* itself being one of our witnesses.

THE DAY CHANGED ACCORDING TO THE LAW AND THE TESTIMONY.

Has the first day of the week been set apart by Divine sanction, to be observed in place of the seventh day, as the Sabbath? Has God authorized this change? Great stress is laid here upon the production of some *express precept;* declaring in so many words that Christ made, or directed this change. It is said—

"Give us your text"—"*Give us your text*"—"To the law and to the testimony;" is the supposed unanswerable demand. Yet, notwithstanding this, "to the law and to the testimony" we will go. In doing so, we will adduce three forms of the argument.

1. If we find an express precept for such a change, then we have "the law." If we find in the history of Christ and his early disciples, distinct traces of a corresponding position, then we have "the testimony;" and in the two united we have the evidence of "the law and testimony."

2. If we find the express precept affirming the *right* of such a change, we have "the law." If we find, then, actual traces of such a change in the *practice* of those who had this *right*, we again have "the testimony;" and in these two united, we again have the evidence of "the law and testimony."

3. If we cannot find any express precept of either kind, yet if we can trace the fact of the actual change, through witness after witness, from the apostles and early Christians to the present time, then again we have "the testimony;" and in the practice of the apostles and primitive disciples of Christ, we have the indisputable proof, that such a change was never made by them, *without the authority*, or *sanction*, of their Divine Master. Hence, in this way, we again, in the end, obtain the evidence of "law and testimony" both. Our appeal, then, is "to the law and to the testimony."

The patriarchs, for the first 2,500 years of the

world, had no express precept for keeping a Sabbath; and we do not pretend that *we* have any *express precept*, or passage, saying in so many words that the change in question was made by Christ, or the apostles; and hence, we pass the first form of the argument. But (2) that Christ had a *right* to change the Sabbath, appears in the fact that "the Son of man *is Lord of the Sabbath-day*," and we therefore introduce him as our *first witness*. If he claimed the right to regulate the Sabbath generally, and thus free it from the traditions of men, and also a *right* to change the days on which the Sabbath should be held; we here then have "the law." Christ's example, or actual conduct, will give us his "testimony." What then was his example? Before his death and resurrection he *carefully observed the seventh-day Sabbath*, according to the true spirit of that institution. After this period, we *never find him observing the seventh day;* but he especially honored and observed "THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK" [*Sabbaton*] as a day for meeting with his disciples.

Luke informs us (Acts 1: 3), that after his resurrection he appeared to his disciples at different times for the space of "*forty days*, speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." At some of their interviews during this forty days, among other things "pertaining to the Kingdom of God," Christ either authorized a change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, or he did not.

If he did *not*, the reason is found in these words—"I have many things to say, but ye cannot bear them now." (John 16: 12, 13.) If, therefore, Christ himself did not make the change during this period of forty days, it must be because it was reserved to be done by the apostles, when the "*Spirit of truth*" should come: for Christ had said, "*He will guide you into all truth.*" The apostles knew what "*seemed good to the Holy Spirit*" (Acts 15: 28), and also to them; and hence said to the disciples, we shall "lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things," etc. We therefore are to look for the first decisive indications of this change to the apostles and their history, rather than to the conduct and history of Christ himself.

But suppose Christ *did* authorize this change of days, in those interviews during the forty days; still it must be made known to the world through the apostles, for Christ never appeared publicly to the world after his resurrection. And what he said to his *apostles* during this forty days we know but little about. In Luke 24: 27, it is said: "And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." And in Acts 1: 3 we find he was "speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." After Christ's resurrection, the old "dispensation of Death" was virtually at an end, and the "dispensation of the Spirit" was fully introduced; and therefore we never

find Christ in the synagogues or meeting with his disciples on the seventh day after this. But for religious purposes, for *worship*, he did meet them on "the first day of the week." See Matthew 28: 9; Luke 24: 18–49; John 20: 13–23. At the close of this last interview Christ said, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."

The *Holy Spirit* was to be to the apostles *more than Christ himself*, and was the one to lead them "into all truth," and qualify them for the work to which Christ had commissioned them. The Spirit was to direct them in the exercise of their authority to instruct, and to regulate the order, the institutions, and the worship of the Church. In all these respects the Spirit was to be the same to them as a present Christ. Yea, more: for Christ had said, "I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away," etc. (John 16: 7, 13); so that under the Spirit's guidance, the instructions to the disciples would be more correct, and the order, institutions, and worship they should prescribe for the Church, would be attended with greater authority than if they were under the immediate, personal guidance of Christ himself. And so, "when the day of Pentecost was fully come," the Holy *Spirit* taught them "to speak with other

tongues"—this being their public anointing to the work which Christ had begun, and which now devolved on them to carry out and complete. And be it remembered, that this wonderful and important work transpired upon *"the first day of the week"*—"THE LORD'S DAY." The immediate result of this anointing was, that the apostles, and especially Peter, preached with such power, that "three thousand souls" were added to them on that day. And thus was "the first day of the week" again honored and blessed of him who was the Head of the Church, and *"Lord of the Sabbath-day."*

Thus on "the first day of the week," we have seen that in the *first* instance we have an account of Christ's resurrection—the exposition of the Scriptures concerning himself—the evidence of the identity of his resurrected body—the commission to the disciples and their investment with apostolic authority: and in the *second* instance, that of Pentecost—the mission of the Holy Spirit, with all of the official recognition and endowment which it involved. All these occurrences, on the *first day of the week*, are just what we should expect them to be, on the supposition that Christ intended to honor the first day of the week, above all other days—in the "dispensation of the Spirit"—as the day for religious worship. Why should all these events transpire on the *first day*, unless Christ, the great Head of the Church, intended —as "Lord of the Sabbath"—to institute a *new day*

as the Sabbath for his people, thenceforth to be distinguished from other days as "THE LORD'S DAY?"

SECOND. We now introduce the apostles as witnesses. What is "the law and the testimony" in their case, and that of the primitive Church?

WHAT WAS "THE LAW?" *Answer.*—TO THE APOSTLES CHRIST GAVE EXPRESS AUTHORITY TO REGULATE THE FAITH, THE INSTITUTIONS, THE ORDER, AND THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH, declaring to them that, WHATEVER THEY SHOULD TEACH, OR ORDER, SHOULD BE BINDING. *Proof:* "And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. 16: 18, 19.) Again: "Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. 18: 18.) This was previous to Christ's death. But afterwards (John 20: 21, 22), on the evening of the day of his resurrection, Christ gave to the apostles their commission to the apostolic work in these emphatic and ever memorable words: "AS MY FATHER HATH SENT ME, EVEN SO SEND I YOU." And when thus investing them with apostolic authority, "he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy

Spirit. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."

Here, then, we have "the law." Hence, under the Spirit's guidance, the apostles could go forth to the work to which Christ had assigned them; and thus order all the affairs of the Church, prescribe her institutions, direct her order, and her worship. In proof that they did exercise this power, the following will show. (1) Paul says: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again. If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1: 8, 9.) The reason he assigned for this was, "For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." (v. 12.) (2) With equal authority they pronounced the judgments of God on bold and presumptuous transgressors. Ananias and Sapphira were smitten dead for lying against the Holy Spirit. See also the pointed rebuke of Simon Magus (Acts 8: 18–24) for thinking the Holy Spirit could be purchased with money. Elymas the sorcerer was struck blind (Acts 13: 8) for his wickedness, by the apostle Paul, being "filled with the Holy Spirit." The incestuous person delivered to Satan (1 Cor. 5: 3–9) for the destruction of the flesh, etc. Hymeneus and Alexander, for their

heresy for saying that the resurrection was past already, etc., were "delivered unto Satan" (1 Tim. 1: 20), "that they might learn not to blaspheme." (3) The apostles, in the same manner, ordered all the affairs of the Church. They directed in the choice of its deacons (Acts 6: 3), and appointed to them their office. They "ordained them elders in every Church." (Acts 14: 23.) It "pleased the apostles and the elders with the whole Church" (Acts 15: 22–29) to condemn "certain" men which "went out" from them, and "troubled" the brethren "with words, subverting" their souls, "saying, ye must be circumcised and keep the law." But to those "troubled" brethren, the apostles said: "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well." They "set in order the things that" were "wanting," or left undone, margin (Tit. 1: 5), and attended to their various duties "with all authority." (ch. 2: 15.) They corrected abuses, and prescribed the proper mode for observing the "Lord's Supper." (1 Cor. 11: 18–29.) They gave directions for the proper manner of conducting the worship of God (1 Cor. 14: 23–40) "so as to avoid confusion," and said, "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you ARE THE

COMMANDMENTS OF THE LORD." And let all *Judaizers* remember this language of the apostle: "*If any man*" think himself to be "spiritual," let him "ACKNOWLEDGE that the things that I write unto you ARE THE COMMANDMENTS OF THE LORD." And then the apostle adds: "If any man be ignorant [that is, determined to be ignorant] let him be ignorant." Hence the apostle said: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle." And "*we command* you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us." (2 Thess. 2: 15; 3: 6.) And Peter also adds (2 Pet. 3: 2): "Be mindful of the words which were spoken by the holy prophets, and of the COMMANDMENT OF US the apostles of the Lord and Savior."

Beyond all dispute, then, it is settled that, the power to "*bind*" and "*loose*," conferred by Christ upon the apostles, was the power to teach, and to order all of the affairs of the Church "*with all authority*." And thus we repeat: Here, then, is "THE LAW."

CHANGE OF DAYS FOR THE SABBATH.

Now to the question, What is "*the testimony?*" In the exercise of the power conferred upon the apostles, did they authorize a change of the Sabbath from

the seventh to the first day of the week? If they did, then the change is as binding as if made by Christ himself. The "testimony" is of two kinds: that of the Scripture record, and that of authentic ecclesiastical history. What, then, is the Scripture record? The apostles, and early disciples, were in the habit of meeting together, at *stated times* for public worship. None will deny this. "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is." Sometimes "the whole Church" (1 Cor. 14: 23) would meet at "*one place.*" The exercises of their meetings were prayer, and various kinds of religious instruction (1 Cor. 11: 1–20; 14: 23–40); exhortation (Rom. 12: 8; 1 Thess. 5: 11; Titus 2: 15; Heb. 3: 13); singing (Eph. 5: 19; Col. 3: 16); and for the observance of the Lord's Supper. (1 Cor. 11: 20–34.) Such meetings were not always held in private houses; but in places of public worship: for it is said (1 Cor. 11: 22, 34), "What? have ye not [private] houses to eat and drink [your ordinary meals] in?" "If any man hunger, let him eat at home," in his private house, and not come to your places of public worship, to turn the Lord's Supper into a common meal, or place of riot! At the meeting at Troas (Acts 20: 7), "when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached," etc. From such considerations, it is evident that the meetings for the observance of the Lord's Supper were public meetings, in public places, held regularly for the

benefit of the Church. The question now arises, *What day of the week did they observe for their* PUBLIC STATED MEETINGS? Was it on the seventh, or was it on the *first day of the week?* What is "*the testitimony?*"

1. The old seventh-day Sabbath is not named in the New Testament, as a day for the assembling of *Christians, after the resurrection of Christ,* only as a day when PAUL met with them. And why he met with *Jews* on that day, is explained in 1 Corinthians 9: 20, to be for the express purpose of *gaining* the "Jews." In Colossians 2: 16, the Sabbath is named, but Sabbatarians will not admit that this refers to the seventh day; although many able critics so understand it.

2. The phrase, "The first day of the week," *never occurs in the Bible until* AFTER the resurrection of Christ. Now, why did the old familiar seventh-day Sabbath cease to be named, except in connection with Paul's *accomodation* meetings; and the *new* term, "*first day* of the week" [*Sabbaton*] come into use, unless there was a CHANGE OF DAYS? There was a change made from the seventh day of *sabbaton* ["week"], to the *first* day of *sabbaton* ["week"]; so far as *language* is concerned, surely. And why *this change of language,* unless the *day was changed* for holding their religious meetings? And be it ever remembered, that it was the "*Sabbath,*" as an INSTITUTION, that was sanctified, as mentioned in the

Decalogue; and *not* the *seventh day of the week.* This seventh day was the seventh following six working days. And the *only* other seventh day of the week, that was ever sanctified, was the *seventh*, after the *six* working days of creation; and so we read (Gen. 2: 3): "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." *Remember*, God did not bless ALL of the *seventh days of the week*, and sanctify *them;* but he blessed "*the seventh* DAY and sanctified IT." But when the Sabbath was given to the Israelites, as found in the Decalogue, then it was the Sabbath (Ex. 20: 11) that was sanctified. This was not the seventh day from the beginning of the creation, for there could be but *one* seventh from that point; but it was the seventh following six days of labor, and probably the seventh day of the week. And again let us "*remember*" that the word *Sabbath* does not occur in Genesis 2: 2, 3. This is the Hebrew *shahvath*, meaning, "*he rested.*" The word "Sabbath," Hebrew *shab-bahth*, is not found in the Bible until Exodus 16: 23; showing that no *written* precept, or command, was ever given to man for the observance of the Sabbath, for more than *two thousand five hundred* [2,500] years from creation. During this long period, the old patriarchs most likely had a law in their *hearts* (Rom. 2: 12–15), which led them to observe a Sabbath. They did not need a law written with "ink;" for Adam alone could be a teacher of the people for almost a thousand years, for he lived

"nine hundred and thirty years," and he received the words directly from the mouth of God. So Christians, although they have had no law written with "ink," yet they have observed the first-day Sabbath, for about eighteen hundred [1,800] years, according to the teaching and practice of the apostles and early Christians.

But another fact. While Moses was with the Israelites in the "wilderness forty years," the Sabbath as an institution is named. Then we pass another period of about five hundred [500] years (2 Kings 4: 23), before the Sabbath is again named. And again from David to Elisha, a period of about one hundred and fifty [150] years more the Sabbath is not named. Then from Ezekiel to Malachi, about one hundred and seventy-seven [177] years more, the Sabbath is not mentioned. Then from Malachi to Christ, three hundred and ninety-seven [397] years more; making in all a period of three thousand seven hundred and twenty-four [3,724] years, that the Sabbath is not named in the Old Testament times, if we follow the chronology as affixed to our common version of the Bible. This leaves us only about *two hundred and eighty* [280] *years* in which mention is made of the observance of the Sabbath, for the first four thousand [4,000] of our world's history. In view of these facts, why should "seventh-day" Sabbath-keepers be so *very particular* in regard to a "law" written with "ink" in the New Testament,

for the observance of the first-day Sabbath? *"Consistency is a jewel."*

The Sabbath which was "made for man," was the seventh day following six days of labor. Hence, the "LAW," which is written in the heart, can, and does, direct to the *first* day of *sabbaton* ["week"] as the Sabbath now "for man," and not the seventh day of *sabbaton*. Therefore, it is clearly proved that the seventh-day Sabbath of the old *"dispensation of Death"* is "done away;" and the *first-day* Sabbath of the *"dispensation of the Spirit"* has been virtually in force since the resurrection of Christ.

But says the objector: "It is not the *law* that is written in the heart; but it is the new covenant." Hold a moment, while we turn to the "testimony:" *"I will put my* LAWS *into their hearts*, and in their *minds will I* WRITE THEM." (Heb. 10: 16.) Will the objector please notice that *these* "LAWS" are *not* written with "INK," or on "TABLES OF STONE;" consequently, the Christian can observe *a Sabbath law* which was *not* written on "tables of stone," or with "ink;" but with the *"Spirit of the living God * * * in the heart."* (2 Cor. 3: 3.)

THE SABBATH AS AN INSTITUTION.

As an institution, the Sabbath consists of two parts; *the Sabbath, or holy rest;* and *the day* on which it is holden. The Lord "rested" on ONE seventh day;

but he "blessed" the *Sabbath* as an institution. Hence, the Sabbath *as an institution*, is different from the *day* on which it is kept. Hence, the Sabbath can be *a perpetual institution*, though the *day* be changed as often as it may be God's order to do so; and still the Sabbath, as an *institution*, remain the same. The seventh-day Sabbath was designed to commemorate the work of creation. But the work of redemption is greater than that of creation. And the *first day* can commemorate *both*—the work of creation and also of redemption. Why is the redemption greater? 1. The *end* of a work is greater than the work itself. 2. The display of God's wisdom in redemption by Jesus Christ was the end which he had in view in creating all things. Without the work of *redemption*, the work of creation would have been comparatively in vain. 3. The old creation, by its unceasing changes, continually decays and degenerates; while redemption, or the new creation, by its glorious change, becomes unceasingly brighter and better. 4. The old creation was a transitory work, made to be changed by fire; whereas the new will be of eternal duration. (Is. 65: 17, 18.) Thus, we see that the work of redemption, or the new creation, is far greater in the eye of God than the first creation. Will the Lord have his Church commemorate his greater work—redemption? If so, the *seventh day cannot do it*, as this can only commemorate the

work of creation alone. But the FIRST DAY can commemorate *both*—creation and redemption.

Hence, it is, that the Sabbath, as an *institution*, is *not* abrogated, but changed to another day, in such a manner as to enlarge its usefulness, and importance to mankind; and thus become a solemn memorial of *two* wonderful works instead of *one*. And, hence, the Sabbath itself, as an institution, is unchanged. And so the Christian Sabbath returns every "seventh day," after six working days, and is a memorial of creation as well as of redemption. And be it remembered, that "the first day of the week" [*Sabbaton*] and NO OTHER could possibly combine all these advantages.

In the 118th Psalm, is a prediction that the day of Christ's resurrection was to be the day on which the Sabbath should be holden in the dispensation of the Spirit. In v. 14 the Psalmist says: "*The Lord is my strength and song, and is become my salvation.*" When Christ arose from the dead this was accomplished. Because of this glorious event, it is said in v. 15: "*The voice of rejoicing and salvation is in the tabernacles of the righteous;*" or in the house of God. In v. 19–24, the Psalmist continues: "*Open to me the gates of righteousness, I will go into them.* * * * *I will praise thee; for thou hast heard me, and become my salvation.*" And then he adds: "THE STONE WHICH THE BUILDERS REFUSED IS BECOME THE HEAD STONE OF THE CORNER." When was this?

Answer.—On the day that Christ was raised from the dead. Hence, David said: "*This is the Lord's doing: it is marvelous in our eyes.* THIS IS THE DAY *which the Lord hath made;* WE WILL REJOICE AND BE GLAD IN IT." Here the Psalmist declares not only the joy and gladness of the Christian Church in the resurrection of Christ, but also *in the day* on which he arose from the dead, saying, "THIS IS THE DAY [the Lord's day, the Christian Sabbath] WHICH THE LORD HATH MADE." And well would it be for the cause of Christ if all would say, "WE WILL REJOICE AND BE GLAD IN IT." That David here meant a day of public worship, is plain, for it is a day on which the *gates of righteousness* were to be opened; and the righteous, or the Church as a body, were to enter them, and on which the ministers of the Gospel were to "*bless them out of the house* of the Lord" (v. 26); or in language adapted to the Christian manner of worship, *in* the house of the Lord. Dr. Watts has given a beautiful comment on this passage:

"The work, O Lord, is thine,
And wondrous in our eyes;
This day declares it all divine,
This day did Jesus rise.

This is the glorious day
That our *Redeemer made;*
Let us rejoice, and sing, and pray,
LET ALL THE CHURCH BE GLAD."

CHRIST PLAINLY INDICATED THAT THE SEVENTH DAY SHOULD CEASE TO BE THE SABBATH AFTER HIS

RESURRECTION. The disciples of John (Matt. 9: 14) came to him and inquired why his disciples did not fast, etc. Christ replied: "Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them? but the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast." He was taken from the children of the bride-chamber; that is, from his disciples. Throughout *Saturday*, or seventh-day, he lay in the tomb. On *the first day of the week—the Christian Sabbath*—he was again restored to them. Hence this became a proper season of *fasting* to them, while Christ was in the grave, just as he had said to them. The Sabbath was *a festival* from the beginning. (See *Nevin's Bib. Ant.*, vol. II., pp. 162–3.) Such it will continue to be to the end. That it was to be such to the Christian Church, is proved by the passage from Isaiah 56: 6, 7, which reads: "Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to learn the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer." The same is also proved by the express declaration just quoted from the 118th Psalm. Fasting, therefore, on the *first day*, can never accord with the original and universal design of the Sabbath. But on the seventh day, the day during which Christ lay in the grave,

it was proper, as he informs us, that they should "*fast*," and this for the *first time* on *that* day. Hence, we see, that the seventh day would soon cease to be a season suited to the observance of the Sabbath; as it must be obvious on the least reflection, that this season of Christ's extreme humiliation, is the *most improper* period for commemorating *with joy and gladness* the wonderful work of redemption. Rather than exultation in this period while Christ was in the *grave*, everything must appear to the *Christian* to demand *mourning* and *humiliation*. The enemies of Christ had prevailed against him, and the "serpent," according to the first prophecy ever given to this world concerning him, "*bruised his heel!*" On this memorable "seventh day" the disciples of Christ "*mourned*" in the most distressing manner; and they never appear to have regarded the seventh day afterwards as a joyful, holy, rest-day of God. But on the contrary, they transferred *this festival* to "THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK" [*Sabbaton*].

The following from Heylyn's *History of the Sabbath*, p. 418, will show us how the apostles regarded the day:

"In their *Sunday's* service they did use to stand, during the time they made their prayers unto the Lord. * * * Such was the custom of this time, and a long time after; that though they kneeled on other days, yet on the *Lord's day*, they prayed always standing. * * * The reason is thus given (as ascribed to *Justin*), * * * '*that so we might take notice, as of our fall by sin, so of our restitution by the grace of Christ. Six*

days we pray upon our knees, and that is in token of our fall. But on the LORD'S DAY *we bow not the knee, in token of the resurrection, by which according to the grace of Christ, we are set free from sin and the powers of death.'* "

This change from the seventh, to the first day of the week, was *not* made without the Lord's sanction; for if it was, the apostles would have been guilty of *disobedience to God* in establishing an institution of their own—abolishing that of God, and instituting their own in its place.

A change from the law *as* written on tables of stone, to that *as* written on fleshly tables of the heart, is indicated by the fact that the *first* tables, made by the Lord himself (Ex. 32: 16), were *broken* and *destroyed* by Moses. But the *second* tables, containing the Decalogue *for the literal descendants of Abraham* to keep, were *made by Moses* (Ex. 34: 1), according to the following express direction of the Lord: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first: and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest."

A CHANGE OF SABBATH POINTED OUT BY THE TYPES IN THE CEREMONIAL LAW.

The fourth commandment is the only one of the Decalogue which designates *time*. But the Sabbath was contained in the law, and observed by God's people *previous* to the giving of the ten commandments

from Mount Sinai; and this, as also the other nine commandments, were incorporated into the ceremonial and civil codes, and stood out there for the people's daily or weekly observance, the same as those which were found on the tables of stone, written by the finger of God. The Sabbaths of the ceremonial code pertained to the *earthly* inheritance—the land of Canaan. When that inheritance came to be trodden down of the Gentiles, as it was ever after their dispersion, so that these Sabbaths could not be kept; the weekly Sabbath remained unaffected. This belonged to a higher order of institutions. The weekly Sabbath always pointed forward to the "*eternal inheritance.*"

In a remarkably clear and impressive manner the apostle, in his letter to the Hebrews, points this out to us as found in his argument in the fourth chapter. But before examining Paul's argument in this letter to the Hebrews, I will notice the fact that, in the Old Testament, the Hebrew word for "rest," or "rested," is not *Shab-bahth* [Sabbath]; but it is *Shah-vath* [rest], and is the *verb* which signifies "*rest;*" and is found first in Genesis 2: 2, 3, where the Lord says, "*he rested,*" and "*he had rested.*" The word *Shab-bahth* [Sabbath] is not found in the book of Genesis; but occurs for the *first* time in the Bible in Exodus 16: 23, and is translated "*the holy Sabbath.*" The word *Shab-bah-thohn* is the Hebrew word for the *noun rest,* and refers to the people, or

to their land; when *they* or *that* were commanded to "*rest*," the same as it does where it refers to God's "rest." Now, by turning to the New Testament, we shall find that the word translated "rest" [*katapausis*] in Hebrews 4 is not often found in the New Testament. The first time it occurs is in Acts 7: 49, where it reads: "What is the place of my *rest?*" In Hebrews 3: 18, it reads: "They shall not enter into my *rest*." In ch. 4: 1, 3, 5, 10, 11, this same word occurs, and is translated "*rest;*" and is called "his *rest*," "into *rest*," "my *rest*," "that *rest*." In this same chapter, and in v. 4, 8, 10, the verb *katapauo* occurs, and is rendered "*did rest*," "*had given rest*," and "*hath ceased*."

Thus we see that Paul's reference to this "*rest*," as is spoken of in Hebrews 4: 1–11, is of important significance as regards the Sabbath. If the children of Israel had obeyed all the commandments of the Lord, then they would have become "*a kingdom of priests*" unto the Lord, and they would have found "rest" in the land of ancient Canaan. Joshua would have given them "rest." And thus, as God says, "if Joshua had [yes, *if he had*] given them rest, then would he not have spoken of another day. There remaineth therefore a *rest* [or keeping of a Sabbath—*margin*] to the people of God." Now we are prepared for the tenth verse: "For he [Christ] that is entered into his *rest* [*katapausis*], he also *hath ceased* [*katapauo*] *from his own work*, as God did from his;"

when his [God's] "works were finished from the foundation of the world" [*kosmos*]; as declared in the fourth commandment. What works did God then finish? *Answer.*—All that belonged to the first world [*kosmos*], which were for the benefit of the first Adam. *How*, and *when* did Christ "*rest*" from *his works as* God did from his? *Answer.*—When he rose from the dead on the *first day of the week;* when everything was finished on his part of the *redemption* of the world [*kosmos*]. God *made* the *kosmos;* Christ *redeemed* it. Hence, Christ "*rested*" from all his work on the *first day;* as it could not be said that he rested when in the tomb, in the sense of this word; for this word "*rest*" applies to beings which have *life* and *animation;* and not to beings in a state of *death.*

The word used to denote rest in *sleep*, or rest in *death*, is from *anapauo*, as found in Matthew 26: 45: "Sleep on now and take your *rest;*" and in Revelation 14: 13: "That they may *rest* from their labors," etc. God "rested from his work in the *creation* of the *kosmos;* Christ "rested" from his work in the *redemption* of the *kosmos.* And although the redemption of all things is not accomplished, yet the work on the part of Christ is "finished;" and "the *purchased possession*" (Eph. 1: 14), purchased by the "work" of Christ, we will wait for, "until the *redemption*" of it takes place, at "the *times of restitution of all things*, which God hath spoken by the

mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts 3 : 21.)

CHRIST THUS SANCTIFIETH THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

Some deny that "the first day of the week" was ever "sanctified." But in Hebrews 4: 10 we have the proof that it was sanctified. For it is there said: "He [Christ] ALSO hath ceased from his own work, AS God did from his." How did God rest from his work? *Answer.*—He sanctified the day on which he rested "BECAUSE that in it he HAD RESTED." Hence, it follows that, Christ must have *sanctified* the *first* day, "BECAUSE *that in it he* HAD RESTED;" or he could not have rested AS God did, on a sanctified day, unless he had sanctified the *first* day, AS God had sanctified the seventh.

"Day ever bless'd
Thy light, thy rest,
I hail with glad emotion;
Ordained for man,
When time began,
For solace and devotion.

"Day more endeared
Since Christ appeared,
The Life and Resurrection.
That morning's rays
Shed o'er these days
His glory's bright reflection.

"Day ever bless'd!
Type of the rest
That for the saints remaineth;
Happy is he
Who joys in thee,
And ne'er thy joys profaneth."

THE TYPES OF THE WAVE-SHEAF, AND OF THE WAVE-LOAVES.

We will now look at the types, which indicate a change of the day for the Sabbath.

1. *The law of the wave-sheaf.*—As we have already stated, the fourth commandment is the only one of *time.* And as this commandment, with others, became a part of the law of ordinances, is there, in this new position, any intimation from God that there would be a change of the day from the seventh to the first day of the week? The *law* of the wave-sheaf, was to "bring a sheaf of the first-fruits" of their harvest unto the priest, and he was to wave the sheaf before the Lord; and this was *always* to be done "*on the morrow after the Sabbath*" (Lev. 23: 11); and of course this must *always* take place on "*the first day of the week;* for if the Sabbath then, was on the *seventh* day of the *week,* surely the morrow after, or day following, must be the *first* day.

The wave-sheaf was not typical, merely, of the *resurrection* of Christ, but the day on which it was offered foreshadowed a change of the day for the weekly rest. The usual argument for changing the observance of the weekly Sabbath from the seventh to the first day, is founded on the fact of the resurrection of Christ on the first day of the week, and its commemoration by apostles and early Christians. This we say, is the usual argument. But behind this there

was an absolute *necessity* for Christ to rise from the dead on the *first day of the week; he* COULD NOT *have* RISEN *on any other day.* Annually the wave-sheaf was to be offered by the priest about the time of the earing of the barley. The paschal lamb was to be offered on the fourteenth day of the first month, and the wave-sheaf not on any particular day of the *month,* but always "on the morrow after the Sabbath" of the passover week. The fourteenth day of the month would move through all the days of the week, but the "wave-sheaf," as well as the two "wave-loaves," were ever *stationary,* on "the morrow after the Sabbath." The passover was stationary as to the day of the *moon,* but the wave-sheaf, and wave-loaves as to the day of the *week.* "Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the priest, and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you; on the morrow after the Sabbath shall he wave it." (Lev. 23: 10, 11.) "And ye shall eat neither bread nor parched corn, nor green ears, until the self-same day that ye have brought an offering unto your God." (v. 14.) That is, this was to be done before breakfast, early in the morning, before any food was tasted. It may be remarked, that barley, in Egypt where the passover was instituted, would be more forward on the fourteenth dav of the month

than in Canaan, and more forward in some localities of Canaan than others—in the valley of the Jordan, than about Jerusalem, elevated three thousand feet above that river.

The wave-sheaf, *the new grain from the old kernel that had perished*, was one of the most striking and impressive emblems of the resurrection that could possibly be presented to the eye or the mind of man. The Jews may have had but a dim idea of its import. It was beautiful as it was striking. Christ was the bread of life that came down from heaven. "Now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept." He fulfilled the type of the wave-sheaf with great exactness, not only as to the *day* of the week, "the morrow after the Sabbath," but as to the *hour* of the day. "Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came to the sepulchre, * * * and they entered in and found not the body of the Lord Jesus." (Lk. 24: 1, 3.) Christ often told his disciples that he should rise the *third day, according to the Scriptures.* Where do we find the Scripture that speaks of Christ's resurrection as being on the third day? It must be found in *this type* of the wave-sheaf, "on the morrow after the Sabbath." Christ was crucified on the fourteenth day of the first month, the day the paschal lamb was killed. He laid in the tomb on Saturday, which was the seventh day (Lev. 23: 4–7; John 19: 31; Lk. 24: 46): and on the third day after his

crucifixion, on the first day of the week, he was raised from the dead, "*on the morrow after the Sabbath.*" Thus, we see the apt, and most striking character of the type of the wave-sheaf, fulfilled in the change of the day, and in the resurrection of Christ in the most signal manner.

2. *The law of the wave-loaves.*—The feast of weeks, was a festival observed when the people had gathered in their harvest, or first-fruits. The law required: "And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering; seven Sabbaths shall be complete, even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new meat offering unto the Lord. Ye shall bring out of your habitations two *wave-loaves* of two-tenth deals; they shall be of fine flour, they shall be baken with leaven, they are the *first-fruits* unto the Lord." These, with the accompanying sacrifices, were to be waved by the priest. (Lev. 23: 15–20.) Moreover this fiftieth day, or "morrow after the Sabbath," was to be kept holy: "Ye shall do no servile work therein," and a holy convocation was proclaimed. (v. 21.) How significant—how striking this arrangement. The seven weeks *began* with a *two days*, or *double Sabbath;* and *ended* in the same manner. Christ rose from the dead on the *second* of the *first series*, and the Holy Spirit made his advent on the *second* of the *last series*—"the morrow after the Sab-

bath"—and appeared in cloven tongues like as of fire. Manifestly, it was a great week, or week of weeks. It witnessed the resurrection and ascension of Christ, and the descent of the Holy Spirit. We see, therefore, that the *wave-sheaf* and the two *wave-loaves* were offered at an interval of seven weeks, annually; *always* on the morrow after the Sabbath." Surely, the hand of the "*Lord of the Sabbath*" is here.

The late Sylvester Bliss, while editor of the *Advent Herald* made the following remarks on this subject:

"The first thing to be settled, in respect to these institutions is, what Sabbath was that, the morrow after which the wave-sheaf had to be offered by the priest? and from the morrow after which the count for fifty days had to be made? Here again it is admitted by all, that the wave-sheaf had to be offered on one of the seven days of unleavened bread: the Septuagint (Lev. 23: 11) says, 'morrow of the first day.' According to some who contend that lunar months are intended, it might occur on any day of the feast. These believe a weekly Sabbath is alluded to, but that it could not recur statedly on any fixed day of the feast. Others, holding also to lunar regulations, admit that it means the fifteenth day of Abib, or the first day of unleavened bread, but contend that it was only called a 'Sabbath,' because it was made a 'day of holy convocation,' and not because it was a weekly Sabbath. But there are others, and among them I claim to be numbered, who hold that the Sabbath in question was a weekly Sabbath, recurring annually by Divine appointment, on the fifteenth day of Abib, the first day of unleavened bread; and that 'the morrow after' this Sabbath, the sixteenth day of the month, when the wave-sheaf had to be offered, was

always the second day of the feast. Now if we are right, in saying that the first-fruits were to be offered on the sixteenth day of the month, and on the 'second day of the feast of unleavened bread,' then be it remembered that Moses says, it was 'on the morrow after the Sabbath,' which makes the said fifteenth day to be a Sabbath. And that this was to be the regular weekly Sabbath of the Jews is demonstrated by what Moses adds, in the same chapter, in reference to the second institution mentioned above—the Pentecost: 'And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering, seven Sabbaths shall be complete: even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days.' Here are *eight weekly Sabbaths mentioned in succession.* The first is the Paschal Sabbath—the first day of the feast of unleavened bread—the day immediately preceding that of the offering of the first-fruits, from which last the count for fifty days began; and the eighth Sabbath is the day preceding the Pentecost. So that the idea that the wave-sheaf of first-fruits was not offered on the morrow after a *weekly* Sabbath, is rendered absurd, and in contradiction to the inspired testimony. On the fifteenth day, Saturday, 'the Lord's Passover,' connecting with that *typical* 'night' and 'day,' 'much to be remembered unto the Lord,' in which the enslaved people of the Jews, under the protection of the sprinkled blood of the typical lamb, 'came out of the house of bondage,' the first day in which 'no leavened bread was to be eaten;' on this significant and 'high Sabbath-day,' our Lord did not show himself to the inhabitants of our guilty world. All had forsaken him; and in his devotion to our eternal interests, he was engaged with our invisible foes, 'spoiling principalities and powers,' 'blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and taking it out of the way, nailing it to his cross,' that he might return to us, 'triumphing' over all our adversaries, with every blessing which had been shadowed forth under so many Jewish

types. Therefore, on the sixteenth day, being the second day of the feast of unleavened bread, 'the morrow after the Sabbath,' and being also 'the morrow after the Lord's Passover' answering to the heathen Sunday, the day when the bundle of first-fruits must be offered, the Divine Savior having previously taken the body of our humanity into his own hand and cast it into 'the dust of death,' and having received it back again as 'the first-fruits' of the promised harvest from the dead, waved it before heaven and earth as our high-priest with God."

Are we not, therefore, constrained to believe that, when the fabric of the *ceremonial code*, which had united with it the *weekly Sabbath*, was about falling to pieces, that God dissevered the Sabbath therefrom, and *restamped the day of rest on "the first day of the week,"* by a series of the most amazing, and stupendous miracles which man has ever witnessed? "God laid his hand upon the *seventh portion* of man's time, and claimed it as his own. It was provided, that, in one day out of seven, the sun should go forth to shine upon a *world at rest—memorial* of what it was *intended to be—relic* of what it once *had been—type* of what it is yet *to be hereafter*, when all things are made new."

To conclude, let us all strive to be like the apostle Paul, as set forth in Romans 7: 22–25. It is there stated that *"the law of God,"* which Paul took "delight in," was *"after the inward man."* But there was *"another law* [mark it!] *warring against the law of* [his] *mind;"* which brought him *"into captivity to the law of sin!"* And, hence, he cries

out: "*O wretched man that I am!*" But how could Paul, and others be delivered from such a "wretched" condition? "Thank God, through *Jesus Christ our Lord;*" when, "with the MIND," they "serve the law of God," and not "WITH THE FLESH THE LAW OF SIN!"

Here, then, in the foregoing argument, we have "THE LAW and THE TESTIMONY," as found in the Scriptures, for a change of day for the Sabbath: and for "the testimony" of authentic Ecclesiastical History, we will refer the reader to the chapter on "The Voice of Historians," commencing pa. 150.

There are, no doubt, sincere Christians who keep the seventh day. I never was more conscientious and sincere than during the three years I observed it. But there was a "veil upon the heart," and, in this thing, I was blindly trying to follow the "*letter*" instead of the "*spirit*," and yet I was ignorant of the fact. My advice, then, to all, is this: be careful and never rest until you *know* that God's "LAWS," which are to be the Christian's guide during the "dispensation of the Spirit," are *written in your heart.* For if you try to follow the "letter" of the "law" as once written on "tables of stone," or with "*ink;*" take heed, lest you dishonor him who is "Lord even of the Sabbath-day," and thus be found doing "despite to the Spirit of grace." "Grieve not the Holy Spirit" by contending for the "letter" (2 Cor. 3: 3–16), as written with "*ink*," exclusively, or by the finger of God upon "*tables of stone;*" "*for*

the LETTER KILLETH! *but the* SPIRIT *giveth* LIFE.' Oh! may "the SPIRIT *of the living God*" write the "*laws*" (Heb. 10: 16) of the dispensation of the Spirit upon the hearts of those who are always contending for the "*letter*."

"Rest, man, from labor! rest from sin!
The world's hard contest close;
The holy hours with God begin—
Yield thee to sweet repose.
Bright o'er the earth the morning ray
Its sacred light will cast,
Fair emblem of the glorious day
That evermore will last."

"The time of rest, the promised Sabbath, comes:
Six thousand years of sorrow have well nigh
Fulfilled their tardy and disastrous course
Over a sinful world; and what remains
Of this tempestuous state of human things,
Is merely as the working of a sea
Before a calm, that rocks itself to rest."

Cowper's Task.

For a clear and comprehensive view of the Sabbath, we will once more quote the late Sylvester Bliss:

"THE SABBATH.

"The Sabbath has a twofold significance.

"1. It was *commemorative* of the creation. Because God created all things in six days, and rested on the *seventh*, therefore God requires that his children, after six days of labor in the accomplishment of their work, shall rest on the seventh. By so doing we keep in remembrance the fact of the creation, and the duty we owe to God as our Creator and the Creator of all things.

"2. It is *typical* of the rest that remaineth for the people of God. This commemorative and typical significance being universal, its observance was not limited in command to the people of a single nation.

"In addition to its universal significance, it had to the Jews a national significance—commemorative of their deliverance from the house of bondage in Egypt. Said Moses to Israel (Deut. 5 : 15): 'Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: *therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day.' To make the Sabbath also commemorative of their deliverance from bondage, the day which God selected for its observance was that one of the seven on which they rested on the shores of the Red Sea and rejoiced over the destruction of their enemies.

"THE INSTITUTION OF THE SABBATH.

"Israel departed from the Red Sea (Ex. 15 : 22) 'into the wilderness of Shur,' a three days' journey, where the people murmured because the waters were bitter. The Lord made the waters sweet; and then (v. 27) 'they came to Elim, where were twelve wells of water, and threescore and ten palm trees; and they encamped by the waters,' till (ch. 16 : 1) 'they took their journey from Elim' and 'came into the Wilderness of Sin, which is between Elim and Sinai, on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departing out of the land of Egypt;' which was just four weeks from the seventeenth of Adan.

"There (v. 2) 'the whole congregation' murmured against Moses and Aaron, because they hungered; when the Lord [Jehovah] said to Moses (v. 4), 'Behold I will rain bread from heaven for you,' that 'I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law or no.' Moses said to the people (v. 8), 'The Lord [Jehovah] shall give you in the evening flesh to eat, and in the

morning bread to the full; for that the Lord [Jehovah] heareth your murmurings which ye murmur against him; and what are we? your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord [Jehovah].' And as 'the whole congregation (v. 10) looked toward the wilderness, behold the glory of the Lord [Jehovah] appeared in the cloud.' 'And it came to pass (v. 13–15) that at even, the quails came up and covered the camp: and in the morning' 'there lay a small round thing, as small as the hoar frost on the ground; and they said, It is manna; for they wist not what it was. And Moses said, This is the bread which the Lord [Jehovah] hath given you to eat.' Thus the Elohim (Ps. 78: 24–27) 'rained down manna,' gave 'them of the corn of heaven,' and 'man did eat angels' food.' He also 'rained flesh upon them as dust, and feathered fowls like as the sand of the sea.'

"This manna they gathered every morning for six days; and (v. 22) 'on the sixth day they gathered twice as much,' at which they wondered and went and told Moses. He replied (v. 23–30), 'This is that which the Lord had said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord [Jehovah]: * * * six days shall ye gather it; but on the seventh day which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none. * * * The Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day.'

"This is the first recorded instance of the formal observance of a day of rest by the descendants of Abraham. The manna had fallen six days, and on the day preceding its fall, Israel had taken a *long journey* (v. 1) from Elim to the wilderness they were then in; which day, therefore, was *not* observed by them as a day of *rest*, as it would have been had they regarded it as their *established* Sabbath. The day of this journey, 'the fifteenth day of the second month,' was the thirty-first from 'the fourteenth day' of the first month, when they departed (ch. 12:

37) 'from Rameses to Succoth.' As they encamped at Succoth the first night, in the edge of the wilderness the second (ch. 13: 20), and crossed the Red Sea during the third night, which was the commencement of the seventeenth day—their time being reckoned from even to even—it was on the seventeenth day that they sang their song of deliverance (ch. 15: 1) on the eastern shore of the Red Sea. From the seventeenth day of the first month to the fifteenth day of the second, the day of their journey from Elim, would be *just twenty-eight days*, or *four even weeks;* and therefore the *seventh* day, from the day of that journey, the seventh day after the manna had fallen six, and the first of its cessation, would have been the *fifth Sabbath* in regular order, after they left the Red Sea, had they celebrated that as a Sabbath in which they sang their deliverance. And if this had been the Sabbath in course, according to the Paradisiacal computation, the fifteenth must have been so too, and would have been doubtless kept as a Sabbath, and not have been any part of it spent in marching from Elim to Sin.

"The institution of the Sabbath was coeval with the creation. (Gen. 2: 3.) 'God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work.' To sanctify, in the sense of the word here used, is to separate, to set apart, or appoint to a holy, sacred, or religious use. By a formal appointment, God thus distinguished from the other six, one day in every seven, and commanded it to be observed as a day of rest—not as a *local*, but as an *universal* observance.

"'The Sabbath,' said the Savior (Mk. 2: 27), 'was made for man.' This declaration clearly refers to its original institution as an *universal law*. It was made for man: *not* as he may be a *Jew*, or a *Christian*, but *as a man*, a creature on trial for eternity, and under obligation to love, worship, and obey his Creator. It is a *reprieve*, during one-seventh part of his probationary existence, from the sentence which would otherwise doom him to *constant* toil; and is so much *left* of what was

given to man before the fall: to *remind* him of the Eden which he has *lost*, and to *typify* to him the Eden that is to be *restored*, when all toil and weariness shall forever cease. His well-being in this world and the next, is thus subserved by God's having blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.

"Dr. Clarke happily remarks: 'God has spoken well of the Sabbath, and good to them who conscientiously observe it.' And Bishop Patrick says: 'The more pious any people were, the greater respect they had to this day.'

"Whether, or no, the day designated for their observance, coincided with the seventh in regular succession from the Paradisiacal week, there are no means of determining; but as it was the seventh, after six days' work in the gathering of manna, its observance answered all the purposes for which the Sabbath was instituted. One of the most prominent of the ten commandments is (Ex. 20: 8–11): 'Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work: but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God [Jehovah-Elohim]: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord [Jehovah] made the heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord [Jehovah] blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it.'

"The words of this command are positive and unequivocal, that after six days of labor there must follow a day of rest. But no intimation is given of the point of time at which the enumeration should set out, and the weekly cycle begin. Had the command indicated this, it would have been accompanied by some rule so that all nations might observe the same hours. But the law is not fettered with that circumstantial exactness which would require difficult and sometimes astronomical calculations to insure its uniform and simultaneous observance, and which now varies according to the latitude and longitude of different places.

As there are no means of learning the day that corresponds to the original Sabbath; and as nothing is added respecting the commencement of the days for work, it cannot be reasonably disputed that the command is truly obeyed by the observance of every seventh day, after six days of labor, independent of any particular method of computing the septenary cycle.

The commemorative and typical significance of the Sabbath being of *universal* application, *a* seventh day of rest is needful to be observed by all who worship Jehovah. But it is not left to every individual to decide for himself *where* his week shall commence, or at what place in the weekly cycle his rest-day shall fall. The day has its *public* as well as its *private* uses; and these require that some day shall be observed by all in the same community. God indicated to Israel *where their week* should commence and end, by *withholding* the fall of manna; and there was a propriety in the selection of that day for them; for that day had a *national* significance, which it was profitable that Israel should commemorate, in addition to its universal significance. God said to them (Deut. 5: 15), 'Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God [Jehovah-Elohim] brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: *therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath holy.'

"As the particular day designated for its observance by *Israel*, was needful only for its *national* significance, it follows that should it *cease* to be a *national* and come into *universal* observance its universal significance might be commemorated on any other succession of seventh days that should be regularly preceded by six days devoted to secular pursuits, provided God should change it. And as God indicated the day he would have the Jews observe, it would be expected—should any event transpire of *more general interest* than one that affected only a *single nation*—that, either by precept or by his Providence, he

would designate a day that should commemorate that, while it should still retain its original significance.

"Such an event did occur. Christ asserted his prerogative over it to change, abrogate, or to perpetuate its observance, when he declared (Mk. 2: 28), that 'the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.' He did not abrogate it, but re-affirmed it. Being of universal significance, it survives those observances which were merely national. The observers of the *Jewish* day crucified the 'Lord of the Sabbath:' and while they were hypocritically keeping the day that commemorated their deliverance from Egypt, his body was the tenant of a tomb. He passed over their day; and on the first day of the week, he who (Rom. 4: 25) 'was delivered for our offences, was raised again for our justification;' which event was of more momentous interest to the whole race than any that had transpired since the creation.

"This event was worthy of *universal* commemoration, and it was a *type* of the future resurrection of all the redeemed; and as such, its day was more fitting for Christians of all nations to observe, than a day that commemorated only the national deliverance of the Jews. By resting on it, it was no less 'the seventh,' after six days of labor, than had been the last day of the week: and, therefore, as well as that, its observance was commemorative of God's rest from his work of creation, and was typical of the future rest reserved for his people.

"After this there is not on record any marked Christian observance of the Jewish Sabbath: apostolic practice is equally significant with apostolic precept; and since then the first day has been recognized as 'the Lord's day.'

"The first day of the week was thus honored by Christ and his apostles; the voice of the Church has ever since uniformly testified to its observance; the Providence of God has abundantly indicated, that this is the day that he has sanctified for Christian worship and communion; and, as those who observe

no Sabbath, neither commemorate God's work of creation nor typify his promised rest, *so* those who do not keep the *Lord's day as the Sabbath*, neither commemorate Christ's resurrection from his work of atonement *nor symbolize their faith in the resurrection of the just* at his second appearing. To keep Jehovah's Sabbath, it is needful to observe the day that he recognizes, and which is significant of *all the truths*, for the perpetuation of which he has instituted it."

The following is from the *London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*, with a slight variation of a few words and phrases:

"REASONS FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF A SABBATH.

"These reasons are, 1. *Man's need of rest.* Is this reason gone? Does man need rest no longer? Is the world now so calm a scene, and earth so serene a region, that no seventh day's rest is needed? If not—if the reason still exist—must not the day still remain? Can the institution be erased when the reason for it still remains, not only as strong as ever, but stronger than ever, in these days of earnest worldliness, and excitement, and hurrying to and fro?

"2. *Time for unhindered fellowship with God.* Is there no longer need for this? Is there not more than ever, in this age of business and enterprise? Adam in Paradise, Israel in the wilderness, when there was no bustle, no tempting world around, needed a Sabbath for fellowship and worship. And do we not in these busy days? And if the reason remains, the ordinance must.

"3. *A memorial of creation.* For four thousand years God kept up this memorial of creation as a thing that was needed; and where is his declaration that creation needs no memorial now? Ah! do we not feel how needful it is to uphold the Sabbath in these days when men are undertaking to prove from

science that the world created itself? Ought we not to prize the Sabbath as God's standing testimony against atheism—God's own loving voice proclaiming, 'I created all this out of nothing'; God's appointed witness to a universe created by himself, against the atheistic theory of a self-creating universe?

"4. *A memorial of the resurrection.* The Sabbath has now become a *double memorial*, viz.: of creation and resurrection. If, then, it was sacred before, *it is doubly sacred now.* And to say that the Sabbath has ceased because Christianity has risen, is just saying this: that so long as we had but *one* reason for this memorial, we kept it up; but now that we have *two*, we must level and efface it.

"5. *A type of the rest or Sabbath which remaineth for the people of God.* That antitype, that rest, has not yet come. And till it arrive, the Sabbath must be maintained. So that, whether you look backward to the old creation, or forward to the new—backward to the resurrection, or forward to the restitution of all things, you see how entirely untouched, nay, how thoroughly immovable, are the reasons for its sacredness and perpetuity. Till these reasons be swept away, the Sabbath must stand. Unless you can say that man has no need for rest, no need for communion with God—unless you can sweep away creation, resurrection, and the hope of the coming rest, you cannot cancel the Sabbath, nor dispose of its obligation and authority.

"The character of a cause is generally known by the character of its friends and its enemies. No one will deny that the great mass of the religious-minded men are in favor of the Sabbath, and the great mass of the ungodly against it. Popery is an enemy to the Sabbath; and wherever Popery flourishes, there the Sabbath goes down. Infidelity is an enemy to the Sabbath; and wherever infidelity flourishes, there the Sabbath goes down. Popish Spain has no Sabbaths; infidel France has no Sabbaths; Protestant England, Protestant America, and Protestant Scot-

land have their Sabbaths still. And may we not conclude favorably of that cause against which Popery and infidelity are confederated as one man? May we not conclude well of that ordinance which takes root deepest, and spreads its branches widest, in the most religious and God-fearing nations of the earth?"

"Blest day of God! most calm, most bright,
The first and best of days;
The laborer's rest, the saint's delight,
The day of prayer and praise.

"My Savior's face made thee to shine;
His rising, thee did raise;
And made thee heavenly and divine
Beyond all other days.

"The first-fruits oft a blessing prove
To all the sheaves behind;
And they who do the Sabbath love,
A happy week will find.

"This day I must to God appear;
For, Lord, the day is thine;
Help me to spend it in thy fear,
And thus to make it mine."

CHAPTER V.

THE VOICE OF HISTORIANS.

From Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho. (Cambridge Ed.) Justin "was beheaded at Rome in A. D. 165."

"Is there any objection, gentlemen, that you have to make against us, beside this, viz.: that we do not live according to the law; that we are not circumcised as your ancestors were; nor observe the Sabbaths as you do?" (p. 38.)

"There never was, Trypho, said I, from all eternity, nor ever will be, any other God beside him who created the universe, and placed it in such beautiful order. We do not believe either our or your God to be any other than the same that brought up your fathers out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand and outstretched arm. Nor do we trust in any other (for there is no other) than in him, in whom you also trust, viz.: the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob. But we trust not in him through Moses, or the law; for then there would be no difference between us and you. But now, for I have read, Try-

pho, that there was to be a NEW LAW, and a COVENANT of greater and much more extensive power and authority than any other; which covenant now all that desire to obtain a blessed inheritance must observe. For that law which was promulgated from *Horeb is now waxen old* and was peculiar to *you only;* but this *new covenant* extends to the *whole race of mankind.* And as *a subsequent law repeals that which was made before it,* in like manner does the NEW COVENANT DISANNUL THE OLD. But a new and everlasting law is given to us, viz.: Christ, and a faithful covenant; after which no other law, precept, or command shall be given." (pp. 40–41.)

"Moreover, gentlemen, I say, I can prove that God has by these means discovered to us that the *eighth* day contains some *greater mystery* in it than the seventh." (p. 65.)

"Moreover, that precept of circumcision which positively commands you to circumcise male infants on the *eighth day,* was a *type* of that true circumcision by which we are circumcised from sin and error, through him who rose again from the dead on the first day of the week, namely: Jesus Christ our Lord: for the *first day of the week* is the FIRST OF ALL THE DAYS; but when all the days of the week are gone regularly round again in their course, it is called the eighth,* and yet still continues to be, as it really is, the first." (p. 37.)

*"*Is called the eighth.*" Agreeable to this is what St. Barna-

From Justin Martyr's and Tertullian's "Apologies," Wm. Reeves' translation, pp. 123–27, and 238–9.

"And in every Eucharistical Sacrifice we bless the Maker of all things, through his Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Spirit; and upon the day called Sunday,* all that live either in city or country meet together at the same place.

"Upon SUNDAY we all assemble, that being the first day in which God set himself to work upon the dark void, in order to make the world, and in which Jesus Christ our Savior rose again from the dead; for the day before Saturday (or *Saturn*), he was crucified, and the day after, which is SUNDAY, he appeared to his apostles and disciples, and taught them what I have now proposed to your consideration." (p. 127.)

TERTULLIAN: "Others, with a greater show of reason, take us for worshipers of the sun. These send us to the religion of Persia, though *we are far*

has says to the Jews (sec. 15): 'The Sabbaths which ye now keep are not acceptable unto me, but those which I have made; when resting from all things I shall begin the eighth day; that is, the beginning of the other world. For which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus both rose from the dead, and manifested himself to his disciples; and so ascended into heaven.'" (Note by Brown, the translator.)

***"*Upon the day called Sunday.*" It was called Sunday by Justin and Tertullian, because it happened upon that day of the week which by the heathens was dedicated to the sun, and therefore as being best known to them by that name, the Fathers commonly made use of it in their Apologies to the heathen Emperors; but the more proper and prevailing name was *kuriakee*, or the LORD'S DAY, as it is called by St. John himself. (Rev. 1: 10.) (Note by Reeves.)**

from adoring a painted sun, like them who carry about his image everywhere upon their bucklers. This suspicion took its rise from hence, because it was observed that Christians prayed with their faces toward the east; but some of you likewise, out of an affection of adoring some of the celestial bodies, wag your lips toward the rising sun; but if we, like them, celebrate SUNDAY as a festival and day of rejoicing, 'tis for a reason *vastly distant from that of worshiping the sun;* for we solemnize the day after Saturday," etc.

From Eusebius' Eccl. Hist., pp. 159–60. He died about A. D. 340.

"The spirit of wickedness, however, being unable to shake some in their love of Christ, and yet finding them susceptible of his impressions in other respects, brought them over to his purposes. These are properly called Ebionites by the ancients, as those who cherished low and mean opinions of Christ. For they considered him a plain and common man, and justified only by his advances in virtue, and that he was born of the Virgin Mary by natural generation. *With them the observance of the law was altogether necessary,* as if they could not be saved only by faith in Christ and a corresponding life. Others, however, beside these, but of the same name, indeed avoided the absurdity of the opinions maintained by the former. * * * As with the former, they evinced great zeal to observe the ritual service of the law.

These, indeed, thought on the one hand that all the epistles of the apostle ought to be rejected, calling him an apostate from the law, but on the other, only using the Gospel according to the Hebrews, they esteem the others as but of little value. They also *observe the Sabbath and other discipline of the Jews just like them*, but, on the other hand, they also celebrate the LORD'S DAYS very much like us, in commemoration of his resurrection. Whence, in consequence of such a course, they have also received their epithet, the name of Ebionites, exhibiting the poverty of their intellect."

There is an epistle (ascribed to Dyonisius) to the Romans, and addressed to Soter, the bishop of that city. Says Eusebius:

"In this same letter he mentions that of Clement to the Corinthians, showing that it was the practice to read it in the churches, even from the earliest times. 'To-day,' says he, 'we have passed the LORD'S HOLY DAY, in which we have read your epistle. In reading which we shall always have our minds stored with admonition, as we shall, also, from that written to us before by Clement."

William Cave, in his *Primitive Christian*, published in London, 1676, beginning on p. 161, says:

"What and how many were the public *festivals* instituted and observed, either amongst *Jews* or *Gentiles*, I am not concerned to take notice of: for the ancient Christians, they ever had their peculiar seasons, their solemn and stated times of meeting together to per-

form the common duties of Divine worship; of which because the LORD'S DAY challenges the precedency of all the rest, we shall begin first with that. And being unconcerned in all the controversies which in the late times were raised about it, I shall only note some instances of the piety of Christians in reference to this day, which I have observed in passing through the writers of those times. For the name of this day of public worship, it is sometimes (especially by Justin Martyr and Tertullian) called *Sunday*, because it happened upon that day of the week which by the *heathens* was dedicated to the *Sun*, and therefore as being best known to *them*, the Fathers commonly made use of it in their Apologies to the heathen governors. This title continued after the world became Christian, and seldom it is that it passes under any other name in the *Imperial edicts* of the *first* Christian emperors. But the more proper and prevailing name was *kuriakos*, or *dies Dominica*, the LORD'S DAY, as 'tis called by St. John himself, as being that day of the week whereon our *Lord* made his triumphant return from the dead. This, Justin Martyr assures us, was the *true original* of the title. 'Upon Sunday [he says] we all assemble and meet together, as being the first day wherein God, parting the darkness from the rude *chaos*, created the world, and the same day whereon Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead; for he was crucified the day before Saturday, and the day after [which is *Sunday*] he appeared to

his apostles and disciples. By this means observing a *kind* of analogy and proportion with the *Jewish* Sabbath, which had been instituted by God himself.' For as that day was kept as a commemoration of God's *Sabbath*, or resting from the work of creation, so was this set apart to religious uses, as the solemn memorial of *Christ's resting from the work of our redemption in this world*, completed upon the day of his resurrection. Which brings into my mind that custom of theirs so universally common in those days, that whereas at other times they *kneeled* at prayers, on the *Lord's day* they always prayed *standing*, as is expressly affirmed both by Justin Martyr and Tertullian; the reason of which we find in the Author of the Questions and Answers in Justin Martyr. It is, says he, that by this means we may be put in mind both of our fall by sin, and our *resurrection* or restitution by the grace of Christ: that for six days we pray upon our knees, is in token of our fall by sin; but that on the *Lord's day* we do not bow the knee, does symbollically represent our *resurrection*, by which through the grace of Christ we are delivered from our sins and the powers of death. * * * After the apostles the Christians constantly observed this day, meeting together for prayers, expounding and hearing of the Scriptures, celebration of the sacraments, and other public duties of religion."

Lord King, in the *Primitive Church*, published in 1691, beginning on p. 120, says:

"Now the principallest and chiefest of these prescribed times was the first day of the week, on which they constantly met together to perform their religious services. So writes Justin Martyr: 'On the day that is called *Sunday*, all both of the country and city assemble together, where we preach and pray, and discharge all the other usual parts of Divine worship.' Upon which account those parts of God's public worship are styled by Tertullian, '*The* LORD'S DAY'S *solemnities*.' Aurelius, who was ordained a Sector, or a Clerk, by Cyprian, is described in the execution of his office '*by reading on the Lord's day*.' And Victorinus Petavionensis represents '*this day as an usual time wherein they received the Lord's Supper*.' Which was observed by the heathen in Minucius Felix, who mentions the Christians *assembling to eat on a solemn* day.' And Pliny reports, that the Christians in his time met together '*on an appointed day, to sing praises unto Christ, as a God, and to bind themselves by a sacrament*.' This was the day which Clemens Alexandrinus calls, '*The chief of days*, our rest indeed:' which they observed as the highest and supremest festival. '*On Sunday we give ourselves to joy*,' saith Tertullian. And before him St. Barnabas, '*We keep the eighth day with gladness*.' And Ignatius, '*We observe the* LORD'S DAY,' banishing everything on this day that had the least tendency

to, or the least appearance of sorrow and grief; inasmuch that now they *'esteemed it a sin either to fast or kneel.'* Even the *Montanists themselves*, those rigid observers of fasts and abstinences, *'abstained from fasting on this most glad and joying day.'* This day they accounted *holy*, as Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, in his letter to the Church of Rome, saith, *'To-day* being the LORD'S DAY, *we keep it* HOLY.' The way wherein they sanctified it, or kept it *holy*, was the employing of themselves in acts of Divine worship and adoration, especially in the public parts thereof, which they constantly performed on this day, as has been already proved; and in that forementioned letter, where Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, wrote unto the Church of Rome, 'That that day being the LORD'S DAY, they kept it *holy*.' The manner of sanctifying it is immediately subjoined, *'In it* [saith he] *we have read your epistle, as also the first epistle of Clemens.'* And Clemens Alexandrinus writes, *'That a true Christian, according to the commands of the Gospel observes the* LORD'S DAY, *by casting out all evil thoughts, and entertaining all good ones, glorifying the resurrection of the Lord on that day.'* The reason why they observed this day with so much joy and gladness, was, that they might gratefully commemorate the glorious resurrection of their Redeemer, that happened thereon. So writes St. Barnabas: *'We keep the eighth day* with gladness, on which Christ arose from the dead.' So says Ig-

natius: '*Let us keep the* LORD'S DAY, on which our life arose through him.' * * * Justin Martyr relates that, '*On Sunday* the Christians assembled together, because it was the first day of the week on which God out of the confused chaos made the world, and *Jesus Christ* our Savior arose from the dead; for on Friday, he was crucified, and on *Sunday* he appeared to his apostles and disciples, and taught them those things that the Christians now believe.' And to the same purpose, Origen adviseth his auditors to pray unto Almighty God, '*especially on the* LORD'S DAY; *which is a commemoration of Christ's passion;* for the resurrection of Christ is not only celebrated once a year, *but every seven days.*' * * * So that the Lord's day was the common and ordinary title of this blessed and glorious day; though *sometimes*, in compliance with the *heathens*, that *they* might know what day they meant thereby, they called it in their phrase, *Sunday*, so termed because dedicated to the sun. * * * The sanctification of the Lord's day is approved and recommended, as by Justin Martyr and Tertullian in those passages already cited; unto which we may add that clear passage of Ignatius: '*Let us no longer sabbatize; but keep the* LORD'S DAY, *on which our Life rose:*' or, as it is more fully expressed in his interpolated epistle, '*Instead of sabbatizing, let every Christian keep the* LORD'S DAY, *the day on which Christ arose* again; the *Queen of days, on which our Life arose, and death*

was *conquered by Christ.*' So that their not sabbatizing did not exclude their keeping of the LORD'S DAY, nor the Christian, but *only* the *Judaical* observance of the Sabbath, or seventh day; for the Eastern Churches, in compliance with the *Jewish* converts, who were numerous in those parts, performed on the seventh day the same public religious services that they did on the first day, observing *both* the one and the other *as a festival.* Whence Origen enumerates *Saturday* as one of the four feasts solemnized in his time; though on the contrary, some of the *Western* Churches, that they might not *seem to Judaize,* fasted on *Saturday,* as Victorinus Petavionensis writes, 'We used to fast *on the seventh day.*' And, 'It is our custom *then to fast,* that we may not seem with the *Jews to observe the Sabbath.*' So that beside the LORD'S DAY, *Saturday* was an usual season whereon many Churches solemnized their religious services."

From Peter Heylyn's "History of the Sabbath," published in London, 1681, pp. 411–423.

"There is (saith Jerom) no sermon of the apostles, either delivered by epistles or by word of mouth, wherein he labors not to prove that all the burdens of the Law are now laid away; that all those things which were before in types and figures, namely: the Sabbath, circumcision, the new moons, and three solemn festivals, did cease upon the preaching of the Gospel. And cease it did upon the preaching of the Gospel, insensibly and by degrees, as before we said;

not being afterward observed as it had been formerly, or counted any necessary part of God's public worship. Only some use was made thereof for the enlargement of God's Church, by reason that the people had been accustomed to meet together on that day, for the performance of religious spiritual duties. This made it more regarded than it would have been, especially in the eastern parts of Greece and Asia, where the provincial *Jews* were somewhat thick dispersed; and being a great accession to the Gospel, could not so suddenly forsake their ancient customs. Yet so, that the first day of the week began to grow into some credit toward the ending of this age; especially after the final desolation of Jerusalem and the Temple, which happened *Anno* 72 of Christ's nativity. So that the religious observation of this day beginning in the Age of the Apostles, no doubt but with their *approbation and* AUTHORITY, and since continuing in the same respect for so many ages, may be very well accounted amongst those apostolical traditions, which have been UNIVERSALLY RECEIVED in the Church of God. For being it was the day which our Redeemer honored with his resurrection, it easily might attain unto that esteem, as to be honored by the Christians with the public meetings; that so they might with greater comfort preserve and cherish the memorial of so great a mercy; in reference unto which, the world's creation seemed not so considerable. By reason of which work wrought on

it, it came in time to be entitled the LORD'S DAY; which attribute is first found in the Revelation, written by St. John about the ninty-fourth year of our Savior's birth. (p. 411.) So that the greatest honor, which in this age was given the first day of the week, or Sunday, is that about the close thereof they did begin to honor it with the name or title of the LORD'S DAY, and made it one of those set days whereon the people met together for religious exercises. (p. 412.)

"The Ebionites, they stood hard for the *Jewish Sabbath*, and would by all means have it celebrated, as it had been formerly; observing yet the Lord's day, as the Christians did, in honor of the resurrec- of our Lord and Savior. * * * And whereas Christian men of sound belief did solemnize the Sunday in a joyful memory of Christ's resurrection: so likewise at that self-same time, such *heretics as denied the resurrection*, did contrary to them that held it, and fasted when the rest rejoiced.

"* * * Now as Ignatius labors here to advance the Sabbath, in opposition of those heretics before remembered, making it equally a festival with the LORD'S DAY; so being to deal with those which too much magnified the *Sabbath*, and thought the Christians bound unto it, as the Jews had been; he bends himself another way, and resolves it thus: '*Let us not keep the Sabbath in a* JEWISH *manner, in sloth and idleness;* for it is written that he that will not labor shall not eat, and in the sweat of thy brows

shalt thou eat thy bread. *But let us keep it after a spiritual fashion, not in bodily ease, but in the study of the Law: not eating meats drest yesterday, or drinking lukewarm drinks, or walking out a limited space, or settling our delights, as they did, or dancing; but in the contemplation of the works of God. And after we have so kept the Sabbath, let every one that loveth Christ keep the Lord's day festival, the resurrection day, the Queen and Empress of all days; in which our Life was raised again, and death was overcome by our Lord and Savior.'* So that we see that he would have both days observed: the Sabbath first, though not as would the Ebionites, in a *Jewish* sort; and after that the LORD'S DAY, which he so much magnifieth, the better to abate that high esteem which *some* had cast upon the Sabbath. Agreeable unto this we find that in the constitutions of the apostles (for by that name they pass, though not made by them), both days are ordered to be kept holy, one in memorial of the creation, the other of the resurrection. * * *

"And so it was observed in the eastern parts, where those of the dispersion had took up their seats; and having long time had their meetings on the *Sabbath-day, could not so easily be persuaded from it.* But in the western Churches, in the which the *Jews* were not so considerable, and where those *heretics* before remembered had been *hardly heard of,* it was plainly otherwise: that day not only not being hon-

ored with their public meetings, but destined to a settled or a constant fast. (p. 414–15.)

"St. Augustine tells us that many times in Africa, one and the self-same Church, at least the several Churches in the self-same province, had some that dined upon the *Sabbath*, and some that fasted. And in this difference it stood a long time together, till in the end the Roman Church obtained the cause, and *Saturday* became a fast, almost through all the parts of the western world. I say the *western* world, and of that alone; the *eastern* Churches being so far from altering their ancient custom, that in the sixth Council of Constantinople, *Anno* 692, they did admonish those of *Rome* to forbear fasting on that day, upon pain of censures; which I have noted here, in its proper place, that we might know the better how the matter stood between the Lord's day and the Sabbath; how hard a thing it was for one to *get the mastery* of the other." (p. 416.)

"The second century affords us three particular writers that have made mention of this day. First, Justin Martyr, who then lived in *Rome*, doth thus relate: 'Upon the SUNDAY, *all of us assemble in the congregation; as being that first day wherein God separating the light and darkness, did create the world; and Jesus Christ our Savior rose again from the dead.*' This for the day; then for the service of the day, he describes it thus: '*Upon the day called* SUNDAY, *all that abide within the cities or about the*

fields, do meet together in some place, where the records of the apostles and writings of the prophets, as much as is appointed, are read unto us.' * * *

"The second testimony of these times is that of Dionysus, Bishop of Corinth, who lived about 175, some nine years after Justin Martyr wrote his last Apology; who in an epistle unto Soter, Pope of Rome, doth relate it thus: 'To-day,' saith he, 'we kept holy the LORD'S DAY, wherein we read the epistle which you wrote unto us, which we do always read for our instruction, as also the first epistle writ by Clemens.' * * *

The third and last writer of this century, which gives us anything of the Lord's day, is Clemens Alexandrinus (he flourished in the year 190) * * * ; *He that doth lead his life according to the ordinances of the Gospel, then keeps the* LORD'S DAY, *when he casts away every evil thought, and doing things with knowledge and understanding, doth glorify the Lord in his resurrection.'* (pp. 417–18.)

"In the third century, the first we meet with is Tertullian, who flourished in the very first beginning of it, by whom this day is called by three several names. For first he calls it *dies solis, Sunday,* as commonly we now call it. The second name by which Tertullian calls this day, is the eighth day simply; *Ethnicis semel annuus dies quis quis festus est, tibi octavo quoque die.* The third is, *dies Dominicus,* or the LORD'S DAY, which is frequent in

him, as, *die Dominico jejunium nefas dusimus*, we hold it utterly unlawful to fast the LORD'S DAY, of which more hereafter. (p. 419.)

"Before we end this chapter, there is one thing yet to be considered, which is the name whereby the Christians of these first ages did use to call the day of the resurrection; and consequently the other days of the week, according as they found the time divided. The rather because some are become offended that we retain those names amongst us, which were to us commended by our ancestors, and to them, by theirs. Where first we must take notice that the Jews in honor of *their Sabbath*, used to refer their times to that, distinguishing their days by *prima Sabbati, secunda Sabbati*, and so until they came to the Sabbath itself: as on the other side the Gentiles following the motions of the planets, gave to each day the name of that particular planet, by which the first hour of the day was governed, as their astrologers had taught them. Now the apostles being Jews, retained the custom of the Jews; and for that reason called that day on which our Savior rose, *mia Sabbaton, una Sabbati*, the first day of the week, as our English reads it. The Fathers, many of them, followed their example. St. Austin thereupon calls Thursday by the name of *quintum Sabbati* (Epist. 118), and so doth venerable Bede. (Hist. Bib. 4, c. 25.) St. Jerom, Tuesday, *tertium Sabbati*, in *Epitaph. Paulæ:* Tertullian, Friday, by the old name,

parasceve. (l. 4. advers. marcian.) *Saturday* they called generally the *Sabbath;* and *Sunday*, sometimes *dies Solis*, and is sometimes Dominicus. * * * The *Saturday* is called amongst them by no other name than that which formerly it had, the Sabbath. So that whenever, for a thousand years and upward, we meet with *Sabbatum*, in any writer, of what name soever, it must be understood of no day but Saturday.

"As for the other day, the day of the resurrection, all the Evangelists, and St. Paul, take notice of no other name than of the first day of the week. St. John, and after him Ignatius, call it the LORD'S DAY. But then again, Justin Martyr for the second century doth in two several passages call it no otherwise than *Sunday*, as then the Gentiles called it, and we call it now: and so Tertullian for the third, who useth both, and calls it sometimes *diem Solis*, and sometimes *Dominicum;* as before we said. Which questionless neither of them would have done, on what respect soever, had it been either contrary to the Word of God or scandalous unto his Church. They therefore are more nice than wise, who out of a desire to have all things new, would have new names for every day, or call them as sometimes they were, the *first day of the week, the second day of the week*, and all for fear lest it be thought that we do still adore those gods whom the Gentiles worshiped. * * * The *Gentiles*, saith the Father, gave unto every day of the week the name of one or other of

their gods: and so they did also unto every month. If then we keep the name of *March*, and not think of *Mars;* why may we not, saith he, preserve the name of *Saturday;* and not think of *Saturn.* I add why may we not then keep the name of *Sunday*, and not think of Phœbus, or Apollo, or by what other name soever the old poets call him? * * * I presume it may give some reason why we retain the name of *Sunday*, not only in our common speech, but in the canons of the Church, and our acts of Parliament, as being used indifferently by so many eminent persons in the primitive Church." (pp. 422–23.)

From Tho. Morer, "On the Sabbath," published in London, 1701.

"My present opinion is, that the LORD'S DAY was observed very early in the Church, and that St. John's [Lord's day] is the same with what we call by that name; that probably the apostles themselves (at least some of 'em) spake in that manner, because Ignatius, who lived either with or very near 'em, has the same denomination. And we find it in the Ecclesiastical Canons sometimes for their antiqity called the *canons of the apostles*, tho' it may be short of their time; that the fathers took it up on the credit of these precedents, and from the conveniency of the style itself, so respectful to our Lord, and so agreeable to the business of the day, being a grateful and pious commemoration both of the honor our blessed Redeemer did himself, and the benefits he

brought us by his rising from the grave; and that all the Churches in succeeding ages have for these reasons conformed to the language, which is warrant enough for us, in a thing of this nature, to follow their examples, and give the day this venerable name rather than any other, at least in our most serious thoughts and discourses.

"I would have nothing accounted more a truth than it really is. Nor should we, as I said, offer any proofs which may shake the thing they are brought to confirm. I allow, nay, I affirm it highly reasonable for *one day in seven* to be set apart to remember the glory and advantages of Christ's resurrection. I can conceive of no day more proper than what we use, to make good that design. I acknowledge in it both the sense and warrant of antiquity; and I wonder at those that are apt to cavil at the *Custom.* * * * And tho' I am not of Metaphrastes' mind to make it the invention of Sylvester I., seeing we read the word many years before him, yet 'tis very likely that the solemn and more public use of it was not observed till about his time, when by Constantine's command it became an *injunction*, and was afterward more generally noted in conversation and writings, religious and civil. (pp. 55–7.)

"This *controversy* about the *Sabbath* is very early, and has as much conduced to disturb the Church of God as any other point of religion. 'The starting needless questions about the *morality* of it, occasion-

ing such disputes and heats as will not easily be allayed. And while one party raised the obligation of the fourth commandment to a pitch that was *not practicable*, it provoked others to *slacken it too much;* and this produced many sharp reflections on both sides, and has concluded in too common a *neglect of the day*, which, instead of being so great a bond and instrument of religion, as it ought to be, *is become generally a day of looseness and idleness.'**

"It was begun by Cerinthus and Ebion, who gave the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul very great disturbance in the execution of their ministry, and were the occasion of that famous council at Jerusalem under St. James, Bishop of the place, wherein it was decreed that *Christians*, specially the Gentile converts, were not obliged to *circumcision, nor any rite of the law of Moses*, in opposition to the doctrine of those men who held and taught that except all were circumcised after the manner of Moses, *they could not be saved.* Here indeed no mention is made of any point beside *circumcision;* but they gave out, not only that men ought to be circumcised in the flesh, but, as appears from the context, they were bound to the *whole law*, and some name the *Sabbath* in particular. After these followed the Sectaries, the disciples of Ebion, whom Isidore calls *Semi-Judæos*, and who made the *legal ceremonies* necessary to salvation, and were *half Jews* and *half Chris-*

*History of the Reformation.

tians. Of the same stamp were the *Nazaræi* who retained the *Sabbath;* and tho' they pretended to believe as *Christians* yet they *practiced as Jews*, and so were in reality neither one nor the other. From them sprung the *Symmachiani*, great *Sabbathizers*, making an *odd miscellany of both religions*, and offering the gross sacrifices of *beeves* and *sheep*, as well as the spiritual ones of *prayers* and *praises*. About the same time were the *Hypsistarij*, who closed with these as to what concerned the *Sabbath*, yet would by no means accept *circumcision*, as too plain a testimony of ancient bondage.

"All these were *heretics*, and so adjudged to be by the Catholic Church. Yet their hypocrisy and industry was such, as gained 'em a considerable footing in the Christian world. So that, tho' the LORD'S DAY had got a very great figure, and was well supported by those who presided in religious matters, yet for a long while the *Sabbath* kept its ground, and both together were respected as *two sisters*. And when in process of time the Sabbath-day grew somewhat feeble, and was at length forced to give way to her rival, the abettors and patrons of it, by a Pythagorean or Marcian spell, recovered it in *our festival*, and changing now and then the *name* of the day, revived the *observation* of it, and made it as solemn and rigorous in Sunday, as ever it had been in the day before.

"This appears from the third Provincial Council of

Orleans (Can. 21), *made on purpose to encounter this error*, and allowed many sorts of innocent work to be done upon the day. This was in the reign of Childebert. About which time, the Romans gave the Goths a memorable defeat, who having *married Jewish women*, and learnt their way of keeping the *Sabbath*, which *they applied to the Lord's day*, they would not so much as lift up their hands in their own defense, and the enemies being aware of it, took that day to assault 'em, and in a few hours utterly routed 'em.

"The contagion had, it seems, spread itself as far as France, and succeeded so well that the people were grown very superstitious in their notion of the *Christian Sabbath*, which occasioned that Council to oppose the growth of it, and thereupon gave that indulgence I before spoke of, permitting all business to be done which did not hinder their coming to the Church and serving God in the hours of public worship. Yet still the others went on in their way; and to induce their proselytes to spend the day with greater exactness and care, they brought in the old argument of *compassion and charity to the damned in hell*, who, during the day, have some respite from their torments, and the ease and liberty they have is more or less, according to the zeal and degrees of keeping it well. And now the *morality* of the fourth commandment grew into great request; which is the reason that Clotaire and Charlemagne, publishing

edicts for the stricter observation of the LORD'S DAY, they so worded 'em as to make Scripture the ground of what they required, *supposing* what was commanded concerning the *Sabbath* equally related to *this other festival;* and tho' the *day* was changed, in remembrance of the *resurrection*, yet in other respects the *ceremonial* part continued, and *Christians* were enjoined to observe it with the same preciseness as the *Jews* did, and still do after the law of Moses. And for fear the doctrine should not take without *miracles* to support it, Gregory of Tours furnishes us with several to that purpose. (pp. 65–67.)

"So that we see by what *sort of men the Sabbatarian* doctrine began, upon what foundation they built, and by what means and arts they kept it in repair. And notwithstanding this, after the reformation here, upon a *show* of piety by the pains and industry of a few men, it came abroad again with more vigor than before, and has not a little helped to distract and divide us. I do not say this was *intentionally* their end, but so it has fallen out. Charity suggests better things; and I hope this zeal was primarily directed against another extreme, and to check that party of men who are so far from admitting the old *Sabbath* that *their* notion of *Christian liberty* is, to observe henceforward *no days* at all. And altho' both sorts, as far as the *Jew* is concern'd, allow the *Divine authority* of the fourth commandment, yet, as to themselves, they very much disagree

in the interpretation and sense of it. For the *latter* so understand it as to make it simply and wholly *ceremonial;* and therefore argue, That under the Gospel we ought to have no *set times* to worship God in, but every man is to be left to his own discretion to *time,* as he pleases, the exercises of his religion; in the number of which Libertines were the Petrobrusians of old, and in latter ages the error is charged on the Ana-Baptists and Family of Love. (p. 69.)

"Scaliger saith, they call *both days* by the name *Sabbath*—the *first* and the *latter Sabbath;* or in their language, the *one* Sanbath Sachristos, *Christ's Sabbath,* the *other* Sanbath Judi, the *Jews' Sabbath.*

"It was indeed Calvin's opinion, that '*at first the apostles for a considerable time kept on foot the* old day *which had prevailed with the* Jews *for so many ages. But afterward being compelled to change it, because of the many abuses which the superstition of their countrymen brought upon it, they did substitute the* first of the week, *in remembrance of Christ's resurrection; which put a period to all the* shadows of the Law, *and admonishes us weekly of our* Christian Liberty.'" (p. 227.)

From Mosheim's Eccl. Hist., by Maclaine.

"Since, then, there was such a variety in the ritual and discipline of the primitive Churches, it must be very difficult to give such an account of the worship, manners, and institutions of the ancient Christians as will agree with what was practiced in all

those countries where the Gospel flourished. There are, notwithstanding, certain laws, whose authority and obligation were universal and indispensible among all Christians, and of these we shall here give a brief account. ALL CHRISTIANS WERE UNANIMOUS IN SETTING APART THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK, on which the triumphant Savior arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the Church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the *express appointment of the apostles*, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed UNIVERSALLY THROUGHOUT ALL THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES, as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers. The seventh day of the week was also observed as a festival* *not by the Christians in general*, but by such Churches *only* as were *principally* composed of *Jewish converts*, nor did the other Christians censure this custom as criminal and unlawful. It appears, moreover, that all the Christian Churches observed two great anniversary festivals; the one in memory of Christ's glorious resurrection and the other to commemorate the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles. * * *

*"It is in vain that many learned men have labored to prove that, in all the primitive Churches, both the first and last day of the week were observed as festivals. The Churches of Bithynia, of which Pliny speaks in his letter to Trajan, had only one stated day for the celebration of public worship; and that was undoubtedly the first day of the week, or what we call the Lord's day."—*Note by Mosheim.*

"There is no institution so pure and excellent which the corruption and folly of man will not in time alter for the worse, and load with additions foreign to its nature and original design. Such, in a particular manner, was the fate of Christianity. In this [second] century, many unnecessary rites and ceremonies were added to the Christian worship, the introduction of which was *extremely offensive to wise and good men.*

"We shall take no more than a brief view of these rites and ceremonies, since a particular consideration of them would lead us into endless discussions, and open a field too vast to be comprehended in such a compendious history as we here give of the Christian Church. The first Christians assembled for the purposes of Divine worship, in private houses, in caves, and in vaults, where the dead were buried. Their meetings were on the *first day of the week;* and, in *some places,* they assembled also upon the *seventh,* which was celebrated by the *Jews.* * * * During these sacred meetings, prayers were repeated, the Holy Scriptures were publicly read, short discourses upon the duties of Christians were addressed to the people, hymns were sung, and a portion of the oblation, presented by the faithful, was employed in the celebration of the Lord's Supper and the feasts of charity.

"*The first day of the week,* which was the ordinary and *stated time* for the public assemblies of Christians,

was, in consequence of a peculiar law enacted by Constantine, observed with more solemnity than it had formerly been. * * * It appears farther, by innumerable testimonies, that the Lord's Supper was administered (in some places two or three times a week, in others on *Sunday only*), to all those who were assembled together to worship God." (pp. 35, 56–7, 109, 110.)

From Neander's History, translated by Torrey, vol. I.

"The opposition to Judaism early led to the special observance of Sunday in place of the Sabbath. The first intimation of this change is in Acts 20: 7, where we find the Church assembled on the first day of the week; a still later one is in Revelation 1: 10, where by the 'LORD'S DAY' can hardly be understood the day of judgment. Thus in the Catholic epistle ascribed to Barnabas, at the close of ch. 15, *Sunday* is designated as the day of jubilee in remembrance of Christ's resurrection and ascension to heaven, and of the new creation which then commenced; and in the epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, it is presupposed that even the Jews, who had come over to Christianity, substituted Sunday in place of the Sabbath. As the Sabbath was regarded as representing Judaism, Sunday was contemplated as a symbol of the new life consecrated to the risen Christ and grounded in his resurrection. Sunday was distinguished as a day of joy, by being exempted from fasts, and by the circumstance that prayer was performed

on *this* day in a standing and not in a kneeling posture, as Christ, by his resurrection, had raised up fallen man again." (p. 295.)

From "Ancient Christianity Exemplified," by Coleman.

"But in common with the other apostles, this minister of the Gentiles [Paul] sanctioned the observance of the *first day of the week, instead of the seventh, as the Christian Sabbath.* This, in obedience to the great command of the Decalogue, was consecrated as holy time; and is in reality the only sacred season of the Christian Church. All other times and seasons are carnal ordinances, having no Divine authority. The Christian Sabbath, therefore, ought to have the *first*, the *last*, the *only* place in the calendar of the Church. Such is its place in the sacred canon. There it stands apart, separate, distinct from all other days, *as holy unto the Lord;* and there it should stand fast forever, in the mild majesty with which Heaven has invested the solemn day. It has *no affinity* or connection with the innumerable holy days, fasts, and festivals, movable and immovable, with which pious usage and *Papal superstition* has crowded the calendar of the Church, and by which *this sacred day* of the Lord was *overlaid* and *lost* for *many centuries*, until brought forth to light and *again restored to its original sanctity* by the *Puritans* of the *sixteenth century*. (p. 526.)

"The primitive Church observed both the Jewish and the Christian Sabbath. The *Jewish converts*

considered the abrogation of the ceremonial law to relate only to their exemption from its burdensome rites; and continued religiously to observe the Sabbath as holy. Converts from Paganism, on the contrary, contemplated Christianity as a dispensation *altogether new*, and the religion of the Jews as totally abrogated. The resurrection of Christ was to them a fixed point, the beginning of this new dispensation, the new *passover* from bondage to freedom, from death to life. * * * The import of the Christian Sabbath they accounted more significant and important than that of the Jewish. The one commemorated the *completion* of the work of creation; the other the *beginning* of a nobler work by the great Creator himself, who was light and life to all.

> 'Twas great—to speak the world from naught;
> 'Twas greater—to redeem.'

The early Christian converts, whether Pagan or Jewish, seem not to have been conscious when or where or how the ancient economy was abrogated, and the Gospel dispensation introduced. But, in process of time, the one was gradually discontinued *and fulfilled in the other. The observance of the Lord's day as the first day of the week was at first introduced as a separate institution.* Both this and the Jewish Sabbath were kept for some time; then the Christian began to take precedence of the Jewish Sabbath; finally, the latter passed wholly over into the former, which now took the place of the ancient

Sabbath of the Israelites. But *their* Sabbath, the last day of the week, was strictly kept in connection with that of the first day, for a long time after the overthrow of the temple and its worship. Down even to the fifth century the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian Church, but with a rigor and solemnity *gradually diminishing* until it was WHOLLY DISCONTINUED.

"No historical record, sacred or profane, has informed us of the first celebration of the Lord's day, the first day of the week, as the Christian Sabbath. It doubtless was very early; *probably* from the *first communication* of the *Holy Spirit* on the day of *Pentecost.* The first day of the week had been signalized by the resurrection and the ascension of our Lord; and now again in the fulfillment of his promise in the miraculous shedding forth of the Holy Ghost upon his disciples while, in joyful expectation of the event, they were all assembled in one place for the worship of their ascended Savior. From this time it is to be presumed that they continued to meet on this day, forever memorable by these remarkable events. No law was requisite for this purpose. The impulse of their own hearts was enough to bring them together on each return of this eventful day.

"When Paul was at Troas, the disciples came together, apparently according to established custom, on the *first day of the week,* to break bread; on

which occasion the apostle preached to them. The apostle also directs the Corinthians, *on the first day of the week*, to lay aside for charitable purposes a certain sum, according as the Lord had prospered them. Here we have, at least, a distinct notice of the reckoning by weeks. What directed the apostle to specify the *first* day of the week rather than the seventh?

"John, in Patmos, was in the Spirit on the *Lord's day*. Whence this early and familiar use of the expression to denote a specific day? It is an appelation descriptive of a certain day, given without explanation, as if well understood and in common use. Here is a fair presumption, if not a conclusive inference, that the day was already known by this name because observed as the Sabbath of the Christian Church.

"Soon after the age of the apostles, the evidence becomes clear and full that the Sabbath was solemnized in the Christian Church for religious worship, and kept as *holy unto the Lord*. Just after the conclusion of the sacred canon, and the death of John the apostle, a persecution was instituted against the Christians in Bithynia, in Asia Minor. Pliny the younger, in reporting to the emperor the prosecutions that had been held against them, mentions that they were accustomed to meet on a certain stated day [*stato die*], before it was light, for the worship of Christ as God. This statement is evidence that these Christians kept a day as holy time, but whether it

was the last, or the first day of the week, does not appear [in this particular instance]."

"Justin Martyr, who lived about forty years later, says that they [Christians] neither celebrated the Jewish festivals, nor observed their Sabbaths, nor practiced circumcision. In another place he says that they, both those who lived in the city and they who lived in the country, were all accustomed to meet on the day which is denominated Sunday, for the reading of the Scriptures, prayer, exhortation, and communion. The assembly meet on *Sunday*, because this is the first day on which God, having changed the darkness, and the elements, created the world; and because Jesus our Lord on this day arose from the dead.

"This sacred day was usually denominated *dies Dominicus—the Lord's day;* but sometimes, also, *Sunday, diem Solis,* in compliance with the common phraseology, and, when it was necessary to *distinguish the day* in addressing the *heathen.* During the early ages of the Church it was never entitled 'the Sabbath;' this word being confined to the *seventh day* of the week—the Jewish Sabbath, which, as we have already said, continued to be observed for several centuries by the converts to Christianity.

"The author of the epistle of St. Barnabas introduces the Lord as saying, 'The Sabbaths which you now keep are not acceptable to me; but those which I have made, when, resting from all things, I shall

begin the eight day; that is, the beginning of the other world.' 'For which cause,' he adds, 'we observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead, and having manifested himself to his disciples, ascended into heaven.' Tertullian, at the close of the second century, says, 'We celebrate Sunday [*diem Solis*] as a joyful day.' 'On the Lord's day [*dies Dominico*] we think it wrong *to fast* or *to kneel* in prayer.'

"'A true Christian,' says Clement of Alexandria, contemporary with Tertullian, 'according to the commands of the Gospel, observes the Lord's day by casting out all bad thoughts, and cherishing all goodness, honoring the resurrection of the Lord, which took place on that day.'

"Dionysius of Corinth, of the same age, in a letter to the Church of Rome, preserved by Eusebius, mentions their faithful observance of the Lord's day, and their reading of the Scriptures on the occasion. These authorities are sufficient to show that the Lord's day was observed by Christians of the second century for religious worship. The use of the term by those writers may fairly be assumed as explanatory of the same expression in Revelation 1: 10, which, in connection with 1 Corinthians 16: 2, and Acts 20: 7, and illustrated by usage of the Church in the age following, justifies the belief that, from the beginning, the Lord's day has been observed in the Christian Church. At first, and for several centu-

ries, it was kept in connection with the Jewish Sabbath; but by degrees the observance of the latter fell into disuse, and the former has ever since continued to be the sacred day of the Christian Church." (pp. 527–530.)

CHAPTER VI.

THE WALDENSES, OR TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST, KEPT THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK FOR THE SABBATH, DURING THE "DARK AGES."

J. N. Andrews, in his pretended *History of the Sabbath,* has greatly perverted the truth in regard to Constantine and Pope Sylvester, respecting Sunday as the Christian Sabbath. On. p. 260, J. N. A. says:

> "To Constantine and to Sylvester, therefore, the advocates of first-day observance are greatly indebted. The one elevated it as a heathen festival to the throne of the Empire, making it a day of rest from most kinds of business: the other changed it into a Christian institution, giving it the dignified appellation of Lord's day."

The object of J. N. A. by such assertions, is to make his readers believe that the observance of Sunday—or the first day of the week—is nothing but "*a heathen institution!*" thus trying to make it appear that the Church of Christ have—ALL THE WAY DOWN FROM CONSTANTINE AND POPE SYLVESTER—in ob-

serving the first day of the week for the Sabbath, been guilty of the "mark of the beast!" I, therefore, now propose to give copious extracts from Jones' Church History, to prove the assertions of J. N. A. to be untrue. Great importance is attached to this matter. For if I prove that the true Church of Christ, or Waldenses, have ever BEEN A DISTINCT AND SEPARATE PEOPLE from the Church of Rome—EVER OPPOSING IT, from the days of "Constantine and Pope Sylvester until the Reformation"—and that THEY OBSERVED THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK FOR THE SABBATH—then, it will appear, that the *"mark of the beast"* will attach to *others*—not to those who observe the first-day Sabbath. Before, however, I give the facts from Jones' History, I will give the following in regard to the origin of the Waldenses:

THE WALDENSES.

From a work entitled *The Waldenses*, published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, on pp. 27–28, we find the following:

"Of the conversion of the Waldenses to Christianity, history gives us no authentic account. Romish historians, as far back as the year A. D. 1250, represented them as the oldest sect of heretics, though unable to tell when or how their heresy began. Their own account of the matter uniformly has been, that their religion has descended with them from father to son by uninterrupted succession from the time of the apostles."

Again, on p. 27, it is said:

"Though Italians, and living upon the very confines of the

Papacy, they have NEVER HAD ANY CONNECTION WITH THE CHURCH OF ROME, and have had therefore none of its corruptions from which to reform."

On p. 33 we find the following:

"Let it be observed, then, that the Waldenses maintain, and have done so from the date of their earliest existing histories, that their ancestors inhabited the country which they now occupy, and held the FAITH WHICH THEY HOLD, SINCE THE DAYS OF THE APOSTLES."

Again, commencing on the same page:

"Leger, their great historian, states, that all the petitions and addresses of these people to their sovereigns, from the earliest times, contained a sentence to the same effect, namely: that they had been in the enjoyment of liberty of conscience, '*da oqui tempo, da tempo immemoriale*,' from all time, from time immemorial. 'And is it not extraordinary,' asks Leger, 'that it has never once happened, that any of the dukes of Savoy, or their ministers, should have offered the least contradiction to the pretensions of their Waldensian subjects? Again and again it has been asserted by them, "We are descendants of those, who from father to son have PRESERVED ENTIRE THE APOSTOLICAL FAITH in the valleys which we now occupy." These pretensions have been passed over in silence. They have been suffered to repeat their demands from reign to reign, and to carry them to the feet of their sovereigns: "Permit us to enjoy that free exercise of our religion which we have enjoyed from time out of mind, and before the dukes of Savoy became princes of Piedmont."

"'I have still the copy of a remonstrance, in which I myself inserted these words, and which the President Truchi, the ablest man in the State, has endeavored to answer on every other point but this. He has, however, never dared to touch upon our antiquity. And formerly, in the year 1559,' continues

Leger, 'when Emanuel Philibert was told, that his Waldensian petitioners professed the *faith which had been handed down to them from their forefathers from the time of the martyrs and apostles*, would that great prince and his court have endured to be told this by these poor people, if there had been one particle of truth to be discovered to the contrary, by the ministers of his royal highness, or by his ecclesiastics, or if any of them could have maintained the opposite, and shown, that they did not descend from father to son from the times of the martyrs, and confessors, and holy apostles?'"

WHERE WAS THE TRUE CHURCH FROM THE DAYS OF CONSTANTINE UNTIL THE REFORMATION?

Says Mr. Jones:

'No sooner were the decrees and canons of the council drawn up, than they were sent to Sylvester, then bishop of Rome, who, in the thirteenth council of Rome (at which were present two hundred and seventy-five bishops), confirmed them in these words: 'We confirm, with our mouth, that which has been decreed at Nice, a city of Bithynia, by the three hundred and eighteen holy bishops, for the good of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, mother of the faithful. We anathematize all those who shall dare to contradict the decrees of the great and holy council, which was assembled at Nice, in the presence of that most pious and venerable prince, the Emperor Constantine. And to this all the bishops answered, 'We consent to it.' The council began their discussions June 19, and ended them August 25 of the same year [325], to the joy of Constantine, the defeat of Arius, and the triumph of the Athanasian party. Eusebius of Nicomedia, and sixteen other bishops, *opposed* the general sense of the council, and rejected the word *consubstantial*. But, finding themselves in so small a minority, and that the emperor was determined to enforce respect to the decisions of the council,

they all, *except four*, ultimately subscribed the confession of faith." (Ch. Hist., vol. I., p. 136.)

The question now arises, Did the party thus opposed to the powers of the Catholic Church diminish, until they were finally swallowed up in it? or did the number increase, and *always oppose* its corruptions? The following extracts from Jones' History will show:

"The truth is, that the clergy of the Catholic Church were now become the principal disturbers of the Empire; and the pride of the bishops, and the fury of the people, on each side, had grown to such a hight, that the election or restoration of a bishop seldom took place in the larger cities, without being attended with scenes of slaughter." (p. 139.) "And as the controversy was now no longer about the plain doctrines of uncorrupted Christianity, but about secular honors and dignified preferments, so the bishops were introduced into their churches, and placed upon their thrones, by armed soldiers. And when once in actual possession, they treated those who *differed from them* without moderation or mercy, turning them out of their churches, denying them the liberty of worship, fulminating anathemas against them, and persecuting them by every species of cruelty, as is evident from the accounts given by the ecclesiastical historians of Athanasius, Macedonius, George, and others. In short, they seem to have treated one another with the same implacable bitterness and severity, as their common enemies, the heathen, had ever exercised toward them, or as though they thought persecution for conscience sake had been the distinguishing characteristic of the Christian religion; and that they could not more effectually recommend themselves as the disciples of Christ than by devouring each other. * * * It was certainly a very just, though severe censure, which Gregory Nazianzen passed upon the councils that were held about this

time. 'If I must speak the truth,' says he, 'this is my resolution, to avoid all councils of the bishops; for I have not seen any good end answered by any synod whatsoever: for their love of contention, and their lust of power, *are too great even for words to express.*'"* (p. 140.)

"And as this state of things continued to increase in progressive enormity until it ultimately brought forth that monstrous system of iniquity denominated 'MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH,' described by the prophetic pen as 'the habitation of devils, the hold of every foul spirit, the cage of every unclean and hateful bird,' we may rest fully assured that the sheep of Christ, those who heard his voice and followed his will, would see it their indispensible duty to SEPARATE THEMSELVES from such an impure communion in obedience to the reiterated commands of God." (p. 141.)

THE NOVATIONS.

"The following is the account given of Novation by the late Mr. Robert Robinson, in his *Ecclesiastical Researches*, p. 126; and I the more readily submit it to the reader, because none who know Mr. Robinson can for a moment suspect him of having any undue predilection for the principles of Novation. 'He was,' says he, 'an elder in the Church of Rome, a man of extensive learning, holding the same doctrine as the Church did, and published several treatises in defense of what he believed. His address was eloquent and insinuating, and his morals irreproachable. He saw with extreme pain the intolerable depravity of the Church. Christians within the space of a very few years, were caressed by one emperor, and persecuted by another. In seasons of prosperity, many persons rushed into the Church for base purposes. In times of adversity, they denied the faith, and

*Opera, vol. I., Epist. 55.

reverted again to idolatry. When the squall was over, away they came again to the Church, with all their vices to deprave others by their examples. The bishops, fond of proselytes, encouraged all this, and transferred the attention of Christians from the old confederacy for virtue to vain shows at Easter, and other Jewish ceremonies, adulterated, too, with Paganism. * * * In the end, Novation formed a Church, and was elected bishop. *Great numbers* followed his example, and *all over the Empire* Puritan Churches were constituted, and flourished through the succeeding two hundred years. Afterwards, when penal laws obliged them to lurk in corners, and worship God in private, they were distinguished by a variety of names, and *a succession of them continued till the Reformation.*' * * * They tax Novation with being the parent of an innumerable multitude of congregations of Puritans all over the Empire." (p. 142.)

"The doctrinal sentiments of the Novations appear to have been very Scriptural, and the discipline of their Churches rigid in the extreme. They were the first class of Christians who obtained the name of (Cathari) Puritans—an appellation which doth not appear to have been chosen by themselves, but applied to them by their adversaries; from which we may reasonably conclude that their manners were simple and irreproachable. * * * Dr. Lardner, in his *Credibility of the Gospel History* (ch. 47), has been at considerable pains in comparing the various and contradictory representations that have been given of Novation and his followers, and has exonerated them from a mass of obloquy cast upon them by the Catholic party. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, wrote many epistles, or treatises, respecting the sect of the Novations, which afford abundant evidence that their rigid discipline was relished by many. Fabius, bishop of Antioch, in particular, was their friend and favorer. Marcian, bishop of Arles, was firm in the same principles. In the time of Stephen, bishop of Rome, a Church was

formed at Carthage for the Novation party, of which Maximus was the pastor. Socrates, the historian, speaks of their Churches at Constantinople, Nice, Nicomedia, and Coticœus, in Phrygia, all in the fourth century. These he mentions as their principal places in the East, and he supposes them to have been equally numerous in the West. What were their numbers in these cities does not appear; but he intimates that they had three Churches in Constantinople." (p. 143.)

"Socrates mentions one Mark, bishop of the Novations in Scythia, who died in the year 439. In fact, the pieces written against them by a great variety of authors of the Catholic Church, such as Ambrose, Pacian, and others—the notice taken of them by Basil and Gregory Nazianzen—and the accounts given of them by Socrates and Sozomen, in their ecclesiastical histories, are proofs of their being numerous, and that Churches of this denomination were to be found in most parts of the world, in the fourth and fifth centuries. 'The vast extent of this sect,' says Dr. Lardner, 'is manifest from the names of the authors who have mentioned them, or written against them, and from the several parts of the Roman Empire in which they were found.'"* (p. 144.)

THE DONATISTS.

"The Donatists appear to have resembled the followers of Novation, more than any other class of professors in that period of the Church of whom we have any authentic records; but their origin was at least half a century later, and the Churches in this connection appear to have been almost entirely confined to Africa. They agreed with the Novations in censuring the lax state of discipline in the Catholic Church. * * * The Donatists are said to have derived their distinguishing appellation from Donatus, a native of Numedia, in Africa, who was

*Lardner's Works, 4to. ed., vol. II., p. 57.

elected bishop of Carthage about the year 306. He was a man of learning and eloquence, very exemplary in his morals, and, as would appear from several circumstances, studiously set himself to oppose the *growing corruptions* of the Catholic Church.

"The Donatists were consequently a separate body of Christians for nearly three centuries; and in almost every city in Africa there was one bishop of this sect and another of the Catholics. The Donatists were *very numerous*, for we learn that in the year 411 there was a famous conference held at Carthage, between the Catholics and the Donatists, at which were present 286 Catholic bishops, and of the Donatists 279; which, when we consider the *superior strictness* of their discipline, must give us a favorable opinion of their numbers, and especially as they were frequently the subjects of severe and sanguinary persecutions from the dominant party. The Emperor Constans, who reigned over Africa, actuated by the zeal of his family for the peace of the Church, sent two persons of rank, Paul and Macarius, in the year 348, to endeavor to conciliate the Donatists, and, if possible, restore them to communion of the Catholic Church. But the Donatists were not to be reconciled to *such an impure communion*. To all their overtures for peace, they replied: *Quid est Imparatori cum Ecclesia?* that is, 'WHAT HAS THE EMPEROR TO DO WITH THE CHURCH?—an excellent saying, certainly, and happy had it been both for the Church and the world could all Christians have adopted and acted upon it. Optatus relates another maxim of theirs, which is worthy of being recorded. It was usual with them to say: 'Quid Christianis cum regibus; aut quid episcopis cum palatio?' *What have Christians to do with kings; or what have bishops to do at court?* These hints are strikingly illustrative of the principles and conduct of the Donatists, who had among them men of great learning and talents, and who distinguished themselves greatly by their writings."* (p. 173.)

*See Lardner's Works, 4to. ed., vol. II., p. 295–301, and

THE PAULICIANS.

"While the Christian world, as it has been the fashion to call it, was thus sunk into an awful state of superstition, at a moment when 'darkness seemed to cover the earth, and gross darkness the people,' it is pleasing to contemplate a ray of celestial light darting across the gloom. About the year 660, a new sect arose in the East, under the name of Paulicians, which is justly entitled to our attention.

"In Mananalis, an obscure town in the vicinity of Somosata, a person of the name of Constantine entertained at his house a deacon, who, having been a prisoner among the Mahometans, was returning from Syria, whither he had been carried away captive. From this passing stranger Constantine received the precious gift of the New Testament in its original language, which, even at this early period, was so concealed from the vulgar, that Peter Siculus, to whom we owe most of our information on the history of the Paulicians, tells us the first scruples of a Catholic, when he was advised to read the Bible, was: 'It is not lawful for us profane persons to read those sacred writings, but for the priests only.' Indeed, the gross ignorance which pervaded Europe at that time, rendered the generality of the people incapable of reading that or any other book; but even those of the laity who could read, were dissuaded, by their religious guides, from meddling with the Bible. Constantine, however, made the best use of the deacon's present. He studied his New Testament with unwearied assiduity; and more particularly the writings of the apostle Paul, from which he at length endeavored to deduce a system of doctrine and worship. 'He investigated the creed of primitive Christianity,' says Gibbon, 'and, whatever might be the success, a Protestant reader will applaud the spirit of inquiry.'* The knowledge to which

Long's *History of the Donatists.*

*Decline and Fall, vol. X., ch. 54.

Constantine himself was, under the Divine blessing, enabled to attain, he gladly communicated to others around him, and a Christian Church was collected. In a little time, several individuals arose among them qualified for the work of the ministry; and several other Churches were collected throughout Armenia and Cappadocia. It appears, from the whole of their history, to have been a leading object with Constantine and his brethren to restore, as far as possible, the profession of Christianity to all its primitive simplicity.

"Their public appearance soon attracted the notice of the Catholic party, who immediately branded them with the opprobrious appellation of Manichæans; but 'they sincerely condemned the memory and opinions of the Manichæan sect, and complained of the injustice which impressed that invidious name on them.'† There is reason, therefore, to think that they voluntarily adopted the name of Paulicians, and that they derived it from the name of the great apostle to the Gentiles. Constantine now assumed, or received, the name of Sylvanus. * * * The labors of Constantine [Sylvanus] were crowned with much success. Pontus and Cappadocia, regions once renowned for Christian piety, were again blessed with a diffusion of the light of Divine truth. He himself resided in the neighborhood of Colonia, in Pontus, and their congregations, in process of time, were diffused over the provinces of Asia Minor to the westward of the Euphrates. 'The Paulician teachers,' says Gibbon, 'were distinguished only by their Scriptural names, by the modest title of fellow-pilgrims, by the austerity of their lives, their zeal and knowledge, and the credit of some extraordinary gift of the Holy Spirit. But they were incapable of desiring, or at least of obtaining, the wealth and honors of the Catholic prelacy. Such anti-Christian pride they strongly censured.' * * * A Greek officer, armed with legal and military powers, appeared at Colonia to strike the shepherd,

†Gibbon, *ubi supra.*

and, if possible, to reclaim the lost sheep to the Catholic fold. 'By a refinement of cruelty, Simeon, the officer, placed the unfortunate Sylvanus before a line of his disciples, who were commanded, as the price of their own pardon, and the proof of their repentance, to massacre their spiritual father. They turned aside from the impious office; the stones dropped from their filial hands, and, of the whole number, only one executioner could be found—a new David, as he is styled by the Catholics, who boldly overthrew the giant of heresy.'*

"This apostate, whose name was Justus, stoned to death the father of the Paulicians, who had now labored among them twenty-seven years. The treacherous Justus betrayed many others, probably of the pastors and teachers, who fared the fate of their venerable leader; while Simeon himself, struck with the evidences of Divine grace apparent in the sufferers, embraced at length the faith which he came to destroy, renounced his station, resigned his honors and fortunes, became a zealous preacher among the Paulicians, and at last sealed his testimony with his blood.

'Thrice hail, ye faithful shepherds of the fold,
By tortures unsubdued, unbribed by gold;
In your high scorn of honors, honored mast,
Ye choose the martyr's, not the prelate's post;
Firmly the thorny path of suffering trod,
And counted death "all gain" to live with God.'

"During the period of one hundred and fifty years, these Christian Churches seem to have been almost incessantly subjected to persecution, which they supported with Christian meekness and patience; and if the acts of their martyrdom, their preaching, and their lives were distinctly recorded, I see no reason to doubt that we should find in them *the genuine successors of the Christians of the first two centuries.* * * * The persecution had, however, some intermissions, until at length Theodora, the Greek empress, exerted herself against them be-

*Gibbon, *ut supra.*

yond all her predecessors. She sent inquisitors throughout all Asia Minor in search of these sectaries, and is computed to have killed by the gibbet, by fire, and by the sword, A HUNDRED THOUSAND PERSONS. Such was the state of things at the commencement of the ninth century." (pp. 185–7.)

VALLEYS OF PIEDMONT.

"The principality of Piedmont derives its name from the circumstance of its being situated at the foot of the Alps, a prodigious range of mountains, the highest indeed in Europe, and which divide Italy from France, Switzerland, and Germany. It is bounded on the east by the duchiés of Milan and Montferrat; on the south by the country of Nice and the territory of Genoa; on the west by France; and on the north by Savoy. * * * It is an extensive tract of rich and fruitful valleys, embasoned in mountains which are encircled again with mountains higher than they, intersected with deep and rapid rivers, and exhibiting, in strong contrast, the beauty and plenty of Paradise in sight of frightful precipices, wide lakes of ice, and stupendous mountains of never-wasting snow. The whole country is an interchange of hill and dale, mountain and valley—traversed with four principal rivers, viz.: the Po, the Tanaro, the Stura, and the Dora, beside about eight and twenty rivulets, great and small, which, winding their courses in different directions, contribute to the fertility of the valleys, and make them resemble a watered garden. * * * Angrogna, Pramol, and S. Martino are strongly fortified by nature on account of their many difficult passes, and bulwarks of rocks and mountains; as if the all-wise Creator, says Sir Samuel Moreland,* had, from the beginning, designed that place as a cabinet, wherein to put some inestimable jewel, or in which to reserve many thousand souls which should not bow the knee before Baal. *

*History of the Churches of Piedmont, p. 5.

* * The Pyrenean mountains, which separate France and Spain, extend from the Mediterranean Sea to the Atlantic Ocean; that is, at least two hundred miles, and in breadth at several places more than one hundred. The surface is as may naturally be expected, wonderfully diversified. Hills rise upon hills, and mountains over mountains, some bare of verdure, and others crowned with forests of huge cork-trees, oak, beech, chestnuts, and evergreens. When travelers of taste pass over them, they are in raptures, and seem at a loss for words to express what they behold. The landscape, say they, on every side is divine. A spectator, taking his stand on the top of the ridge of these mountains, will observe that, at the foot, on the Spanish side, lie Asturias, Old Castile, Arragon, and Catalonia; and on the French side, Guiemme and Languedoc, Toulouse, Bearn, Abby, Roussillon, and Narbonne, *all of which places* WERE REMARKABLE IN THE DARKEST TIMES *for harboring Christians who were reputed* HERETICS.* Indeed, from the borders of Spain, throughout the greatest part of the south of France, among and below the Alps, along the Rhine, and even to Bohemia, thousands of the disciples of Christ, as will hereafter be shown, were found, even in the very worst of times, *preserving the faith in its purity*, adhering to the simplicity of Christian worship, patiently bearing the cross after Christ—men distinguished by their fear of God and obedience to his will, and persecuted only for righteousness' sake. * * * In the following century, a firm and noble stand was made against the Papal usurpations, by Paulinus, bishop of the Church of Aquileia, in Italy. This venerable man was born about the year 726, near Friuli; but of the earlier part of his life, we know little more than that he was in great favor with Charles the Great, king of France, and preached the Gospel to the Pagans of Carinthia and Styria, and to the Avares, a nation of Huns. In the year 776, he was ordained bishop of Aquileia, in which office

*Robinson's Eccl. Researches, p. 280.

he continued laboring till his death, which took place in 804. He seemed to have possessed a strong and enlightened mind, for there are few of the abominations of his time which he does not appear to have combated.

"In the year 787 he, and some other Italian bishops, agreed to condemn the decrees of the famous second council of Nice, which had established the worship of images, declaring it to be idolatrous, and that, too, notwithstanding the council had received the sanction of Pope Adrian, who was present at its deliberations, and exerted all his authority to maintain its decisions. *This shows* that at *this time*, the despotism of anti-christ was not universally owned, even throughout *Italy itself*. * * *

"But the succession of events now leads me to call the reader's attention to the life and labors of Claude, bishop of Turin. This truly great man, who has not improperly been called the first Protestant reformer, was born in Spain. In his early years he was chaplain in the court of the emperor Lewis the Meek (Ludovicus Pius, king of France and emperor of the West), and was even then in high repute for his knowledge of the Scriptures, and his first-rate talents as a preacher, in consequence of which, says the Abbe Fleury, Lewis perceiving the deplorable ignorance of a great part of Italy in regard to the doctrines of the Gospel, and desirous of providing the Churches of Piedmont with one who might stem the growing torrent of image-worship, promoted Claude to the See of Turin about the year 817. In this event, the attentive reader will hereafter perceive the hand of God so ordering the course of events in his holy providence, as, in the very worst of times, to prepare 'a seed to serve him, and a generation to call him blessed.' * * * 'In truth,' says Fleury, *himself a Catholic writer*, 'he began to preach and instruct with great application.' His first zeal was directed against images, relics, pilgrimages, and crosses. * * * The monks were presently up in arms against him, reviling him as a blasphemer and a heretic, and his own people became

so refractory, that, in a little time, he went about in fear of his life. Supported, however, by the testimony of a good conscience, and a confidence in the goodness of his cause, Claude persevered, and wrote comments on several books of Scripture, of which, unfortunately, the only one that has been printed is his Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians.

"'He bore a noble testimony,' says Mr. Robinson, in his *Ecclesiastical Researches* (p. 447), 'against the prevailing errors of his time, and was undoubtedly a most respectable character.' * * * Throughout the whole of his writings, he maintains that 'Jesus Christ alone is the Head of the Church.' *This*, the reader will perceive, *struck immediately at the root of the first principle of Popery*, the vicarious office of the bishop of Rome. * * * He maintained, that men are justified by faith, without the deeds of the law—*the doctrine which* LUTHER, SEVEN HUNDRED YEARS AFTERWARD, so ably contended for, and which so excessively provoked the advocates of the Church of Rome. * * * He lashed in the severest manner, the superstition and idolatry which everywhere abounded under the countenance and authority of the See of Rome. The writings of Claude were voluminous; for he was indefatigable in explaining the Scriptures, and in opposing the torrent of superstition. He wrote three books upon Genesis in the year 815; and also a Commentary on the Gospel by Matthew, of which there are several copies in England. He wrote a Commentary on Exodus in the year 821, and another on Leviticus in 823, beside which, he wrote comments *on all the apostolic epistles*, which have been since found, in manuscript, in two volumes, in the Abbey of Fleury, near Orleans, in France. In the year 828, Claude was attacked most fiercely by a French monkish writer, of the name of Dungalus, who censures him for taking upon himself, after a lapse of more than eight hundred and twenty years, to reprove those things that had hitherto been in continual use, as if there had been none before himself that had ever had any zeal for religion.

About the same time, another writer of the same school, whose name was Theodemirus, wrote to him, giving him to understand that his opinions and behavior everywhere gave great offence. His answer to these writers was such as made it quite unnecessary for him to write another treatise on the same or a similar occasion; and in the following extracts from it the reader may almost persuade himself that he is perusing the pages of the immortal Luther.

"'I have received,' says he to Theodemirus, 'by a special messenger, your letter, with the articles, wholly stuffed with babbling and fooleries. You declare in these articles, that you have been troubled that my fame was spread not only throughout all Italy, but also in Spain and elsewhere; as if I were preaching a new doctrine, or setting myself up as the founder of a new sect, contrary to the rules of the ancient Catholic faith, which is an absolute falsehood. But it is no wonder that the members of Satan should talk of me at this rate, since they called Christ, our Head, a deceiver, and one that had a devil, &c. For I teach no new heresy, but keep myself to the *pure truth*, preaching and publishing nothing but that. On the contrary, as far as in me lies, I have repressed, opposed, cast down, and destroyed, and do still repress, oppose, and destroy, to the utmost of my power, all sects, schisms, superstitions, and heresies, and shall never cease so to do, God being my helper, as far as in me lies.

"'When I came to Turin, I found all the churches full of abominations and images; and because I began to destroy what every one adored, every one began to open his mouth against me. These kind of people against whom we have undertaken to defend the Church of God, tell us, if you write upon the wall, or draw the images of Paul, of Jupiter, of Saturn, or Mercury, neither are the one of these gods, nor the other apostles, and neither the one or the other of these are men, and therefore the name is changed. But, surely, if we ought to worship them,

we ought rather to worship them during their lifetime, than as thus represented as the portraits of beasts, or (what is yet more true) of stone or wood, which have neither life, feeling, nor reason. 'For if we may neither worship nor serve the works of God's hand, how much less may we worship the works of men's hands. * * * But mark what the followers of superstition and false religion allege! They tell us it is in commemoration and honor of our Savior that we serve, honor, and adore the cross—persons whom nothing in the Savior pleaseth but that which was pleasing to the ungodly, viz.: the reproach of his sufferings and the token of his death. Hereby they evince that they perceive only of him what the wicked saw and perceived of him, whether Jews or heathens, who do not see his resurrection, and do not consider him but as altogether swallowed up of death, without regarding what the apostle says, "We knew Jesus Christ no longer according to the flesh." God commands one thing, and these people do quite the contrary. God commands us to *bear* our cross and not to *worship it*. But these are *all for worshiping it*—whereas they do not *bear it at all.* * * * The fifth thing for which you reproach me is, that you are much displeased because "the apostolic lord" (for so you are pleased to nominate the late Pope Paschal) had honored me with the charge. But you should remember that *he only is apostolic who is the keeper and guardian of the apostle's doctrine*, and not he who boasts himself of being seated in the chair of the apostle, and in the meantime neglects to acquit himself of the apostolic charge; for the Lord saith that the Scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses' seat.'*

"From these extracts, some estimate may be formed of the principles and character of Claude of Turin, a name less known in the present day, and a character less honored, than they deserve." (pp. 188–195.)

"During the dark ages which succeeded the invasion of Eu-

*Allix's Remarks, ch. 9, p. 64–77.

rope by the barbarous nations, when feudal anarchy distracted the civil governments, and a flood of superstition had deluged the Church, Christianity, banished from the seats of empire, and loathing the monkish abodes of indolence and vice, meekly retired into the sequestered valleys of Piedmont. *Finding there* a race of men unarrayed in hostile armor, *uncontaminated by the doctrines and commandments of an apostate Church*; unambitious in their temper, and simple in their manners, she preferred their society, and among them took up her abode. * * * Remote from the influence of noisy parties, and little conversant with literature, we can scarcely expect any notice of them until their increase and prosperity excited the attention of ambition and avarice, and occasioned it to be rumored in the neighboring ecclesiastical states that a numerous people occupied the southern valleys of the Alps, whose *faith and practice differed from those of the Romish Church*, who paid no tithes, offered no mass, worshiped no saints, nor had recourse to any of the prescribed means for redeeming their souls from purgatory. * * * Finding that these people were not to be controlled by the authority and denunciations of the Church of Rome, the aid of the civil power was demanded. The princes and nobles of the adjacent countries at first refused to disturb them. They had beheld with pleasure their simple manners, their uprightness and integrity, their readiness to oblige, and their fidelity in the discharge of all the duties of civil and social life. The clamor of the Romish clergy, however, ultimately prevailed, and the civil power was armed against the peaceable and inoffensive inhabitants of the valleys. Scaffolds were erected, and fires kindled, at Turin, and other cities around them. The fortitude and confidence of the martyrs, however, increased as their faith and constancy were tried.

"'Favor me,' said Catalan Girard, who was one of their number, as he sat upon the funeral pile at Reuel, 'favor me with those two flint-stones,' which he saw near him. Being handed

to him, he added, as he threw them to the ground, 'Sooner shall I eat these stones than you shall be able, by persecution, to destroy the religion for which I die.'* Multitudes, however, fled like innocent and defenseless sheep from these devouring wolves. They crossed the Alps, and traveled in every direction, as Providence and the prospect of safety conducted them, into Germany, England, France, Italy, and other countries. There they trimmed their lamps, and shone with new lustre. Their worth everywhere drew attention, and their doctrine formed increasing circles around them. The storm which threatened their destruction only scattered them as the precious seeds of the glorious reformation of the Christian Church."† (pp. 207–8.)

"We have some additional information concerning these people given us by Egbert, a monk, and afterward abbot of Schonauge, who tells us that he had often disputed with these heretics, and that he had learned still more of their opinions from those who had, through the force of torments and the threat of being burned, renounced their communion. He says 'they are commonly called *Cathari* [Puritans], a sort of people *very pernicious to the Catholic faith*, which, like moths they corrupt and destroy.' He adds, that they were divided into several sects, and *maintained their opinions by the authority of Scripture.* He takes particular notice of their denying the utility of baptism to infants, which, say they, through their incapacity, avails nothing to their salvation; *insisting that baptism* ought to be deferred till they come to *years of discretion*, and that even then those *only should be baptized* who make a *personal profession of faith*, and desire it.‡ * * * They are increased to *great multitudes throughout all countries*, to the great danger of the [Catholic] Church; for their words eat

*Perrin's History of the Vaudois, part 2, b. 2, ch. 4.

†Dr. Rankin's History of France, vol. III., p. 193–198.

‡See his sermon against the Cathari, in Bib. Pat. tom. 2, p. 99, 106; D'Anver's Hist. Bapt., p. 249.

like a canker, and, like a flying leprosy, run every way, infecting the precious members of Christ (meaning the Romish Church). These, in our Germany, we call *Cathari;* in Flanders they call them *Pihphles;* in French, *Tisserands*, from the art of weaving, because numbers of them are of that occupation."*

"Thus, by comparing together these several fragments of information, we may acquire some distinct notion of these *Cathari.* They were a plain, unassuming, harmless, and industrious race of Christians, patiently bearing the cross after Christ, *both* in their *doctrine* and *manners* condemning the *whole system of idolatry and superstition which reigned in the Church of Rome*, placing true religion in the faith, hope, and obedience of the Gospel, maintaining a supreme regard to the authority of God in his Word, and regulating their sentiments and practices by that Divine standard. Even in the *twelfth century* their numbers abounded in the neighborhood of Cologne, in Flanders, the south of France, Savoy, and Milan. 'They were increased,' says Egbert, '*to great multitudes*, THROUGHOUT ALL COUNTRIES;' and although they seem not to have attracted attention in any remarkable degree previous to this period, yet, as it is obvious they could not have sprung up in a day, it is not an unfair inference that they must have long existed as a people *wholly distinct from the Catholic Church*, though, amidst the political squabbles of the clergy, it was their good fortune to be almost entirely overlooked. * * * Toward the middle of the twelfth century, a small society of these *Puritans*, as they were called by some, or *Waldenses*, as they are termed by others, or *Paulicians*, as they are denominated by our old monkish historian, William of Neuburg, made their appearance in England. This latter writer, speaking of them, says 'they came originally from Gascoyne, where *being as nu-*

*Dr. Allix's Remarks, p. 150.

merous as the sands of the sea, they sorely infested both France, Italy, Spain, and England.' * * *

"By the council of Tours, held in 1163, princes were exhorted and directed to imprison all heretics within their dominions, and to confiscate their effects. * * * But the *Cathari*, or Puritans, were not the only sect which during the twelfth century appeared in *opposition* to the superstition of the Church of Rome. About the year 1110, in the south of France, in the provinces of Languedoc and Provence, appeared Peter de Bruys preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of heaven. * * * His labors were crowned with abundant success. He converted a great number of persons to the faith of Christ, and, after a most indefatigable ministry of twenty years' continuance, he was burnt at St. Giles', a city of Languedoc, in France, in the year 1130. * * * His followers were called Petrobrusians; but of his doctrinal sentiments the following are those alone which we can be sure of at this remote period: That the ordinance of baptism was to be administered only to adults, * * * that crucifixes were objects of superstition, and ought to be destroyed—that in the Lord's Supper the real body and blood of Christ were not exhibited, but only represented in the way of symbol or figure—and, lastly, that the oblations, prayers, and good works of the living could in no respect be beneficial to the dead."*

"A few years after the death of Peter Bruys, rose up an Italian by birth, of the name of Henry, said to have been his disciple, and who was the founder of a new sect called the Henricians. He had been both a monk and a hermit; but having received the knowledge of the truth, he labored to reform the superstition of the times. * * * At Toulouse, he was warmly *opposed* by the great St. Bernard, that luminary of the *Catholic Church*, who though he wrote against him with great

*Mosheim's Ch. Hist., vol. III., cent. 12, part 2, ch. 5, and the authors there referred to.

bitterness, is nevertheless constrained to admit that Henry was a learned man, and greatly respected by his numerous followers. * * * His doctrinal sentiments have not been handed down to us in a manner so full and explicit as could be wished. 'All we know is, that he rejected *infant* baptism; censured with severity the corrupt and licentious manners of the clergy; treated the *festivals* and *ceremonies* of the *Catholic Church* with the *utmost contempt;* and held private assemblies in which he explained and inculcated his peculiar sentiments.'* (pp. 212–14.)

"This seems to be the proper place for introducing some particular mention of the sect of the Paterines. The most copious account of them that I have met with, is that given by Mr. Robinson, in his Ecclesiastical Researches; and as it appears to be well supported by the authorities which he has adduced, and to correspond with what is said of the same people by Dr. Allix, Mosheim, and others, I present it to the reader mostly in his own words. Much has been written on the etymology of the word Paterine; but as the Italians themselves are not agreed on the derivation, it is not likely foreigners should be able to determine it. In Milan, where it was first used, it answered to the English words, vulgar, illiterate, low-bred; and these people were so called because they were chiefly of the lower order of men, mechanics, artificers, manufacturers, and others, who lived by their honest labor. *Gazari* is corruption of *Cathari*—puritans. * * * They said a Christian Church ought to consist of only good people; * * * faith without works could not save a man; the Church ought not to persecute any, even the wicked; the law of Moses was no rule to Christians; * * * the SACRAMENTS, and orders, and CEREMONIES of the *Church of Rome* were futile, expensive, oppressive, and wicked; with many more such positions, all inimical to the hierarchy. * * * Among other things they said that a child knew

*Mosheim, vol. III., cent. 12, part 2, ch. 5.

nothing of the matter, that he had no desire to be baptized, and was incapable of making any confession of faith, and that the willing and professing of another could be of no service to him. 'Here, then,' says Dr. Allix, very truly, 'we have found a body of men in Italy, before the year 1026, *five hundred years* before the Reformation, who believed contrary to the opinions of the Church of Rome, and who *highly condemned* their errors.' Atto, bishop of Vereculli, had complained of such people eighty years before, and so had others *before him;* and there is the highest reason to believe that they had ALWAYS EXISTED IN ITALY. * * * The houses where they met seem to have been hired by the people, and tenanted by one of the brethren. There were several in each city, and each was distinguished by a mark known by themselves. They had bishops or elders, pastors, and teachers, deacons, and messengers; that is, men employed in traveling to administer to the relief and comfort of the poor and the persecuted. In times of persecution they met in small companies of eight, twenty, thirty, or as it might happen; but never in large assemblies for fear of the consequences. The Paterines were decent in their deportment, modest in their dress and discourse, and their morals irreproachable. In their conversation there was no levity, no scurrility, no detraction, no falsehood, no swearing. Their dress was neither fine nor mean. They were chaste and temperate, never frequenting taverns, or places of public amusement. They were not given to anger and other violent passions. They were not eager to accumulate wealth, but content with the necessaries of life. * * * About the year 1040, the Paterines had become very numerous at Milan, which was their principal residence, and here they flourished at least two hundred years. They had no connection with the [Catholic] Church; for they rejected not only Jerom of Syria, Agustine of Africa, and Gregory of Rome, but Ambrose of Milan, considering them and other pretended Fathers as corrupters of Christianity. They particularly CONDEMNED

POPE SYLVESTER AS ANTICHRIST. THEY CALLED [the adoration of] the CROSS the MARK OF THE BEAST. * * * About the year 1176, the archbishop of Milan, an infirm old man, while preaching against them with great vehemence, dropped down in a fit, and expired as soon as he had received extreme unction! About fourteen years afterward, one Bonacursi, *who pretended he had been one of these Paterines*, made a public renunciation of his opinions, and embraced the Catholic faith, filling Milan with fables, as all renegadoes do." (pp. 217–19.)

"Having sketched the more prominent features of the Christian Church for the first ten centuries, and arriving at that period in which we are to give the reader some account of the Waldenses, it will be proper to introduce the subject by an attempt to ascertain the origin of their distinguishing appellation. The learned Mosheim contends with considerable pertinacity that they derived their name from Peter Waldo, an opulent merchant of Lyons, whose history will presently come under our notice; but in this he is contradicted by his learned translator, and, I believe, I may truly add, by most authors of authority since his time. The most satisfactory definition that I have met with of the term *Waldenses*, is that given by Mr. Robinson in his *Ecclesiastical Researches;* and, in the confidence that it is the true one, and that I may not unnecessarily trespass on the reader's time and patience, I submit it to his consideration.

"From the Latin word VALLIS came the English word *valley*, the French and Spanish *valle*, the Italian *valdesi*, the Low Dutch *valleye*, the Provencial *vaux vaudois*, the ecclesiastical *Valdenses*, and *Waldenses*. The words simply signify valleys, inhabitants of valleys, and no more.

"It happened that the inhabitants of the valleys of the Pyrenees did *not profess the Catholic faith;* it fell out also that the inhabitants of the valleys about the Alps did not embrace it; it happened moreover, in the ninth century, that one Valdo, a

friend and counselor of Berengarius, and a man of eminence, who had many followers, did not approve of the Papal discipline and doctrine; and it came to pass, about a hundred and thirty years after, that a rich merchant of Lyons, who was called Valdus, or Waldo, openly disavowed the Roman Catholic religion, supported many to teach the doctrines believed in the valleys, and became the instrument of the conversion of great numbers; ALL THESE PEOPLE WERE CALLED WALDENSES.* This view of the matter, which to myself appears indisputably the true one, is also supported by the authority of their own historians, Pierre Gilles, Perrin, Leger, Sirs, Moreland, and Dr. Allix.

"To the preceding account of the derivation of the term Waldenses, I shall now add the explanation given by these writers of various other appellations that were bestowed on this class of Christians, and particularly that of Albigenses. The names imposed on them in France by their adversaries, they say, have been intended to vilify and ridicule them, or to represent them as new and different sects. Being stripped of all their property, and reduced by persecution to extreme poverty, they have been called 'the poor of Lyons.' From their mean and famished appearance in their exiled and destitute state, they have been called, in provincial jargon, 'Siccan,' or pickpockets. Because they *would not observe saints' days*, they were *falsely* supposed to neglect the *Sabbath also*, and called '*Inzabbatati* or *Insabbathists*.' As they denied transubstantiation, or the personal and divine presence of Jesus Christ in the host, or wafer exhibited in the mass, they were called 'Arians.' Their adversaries, premising that all power must be derived from God *through his vicegerent the Pope*, or from an opposite and evil principle, inferred that the Waldenses were 'Manichæans,' because they denied the Pope's supremacy over the emperors and kings of the earth.

*Ecclesiastical Researches, pp. 302, 303.

"In Languedoc, the Catholics affirmed that the origin of these heretics was recent, and that they derived their name of Vaudois, or Waldenses from Peter Waldo, one of their barbes or preachers, whose immediate followers were called Waldenses. But this was rather the *renovation* of the name from a particular cause than its *original*. Accordingly it extended over that district only in France where Peter Waldo preached; for in other districts the people who were branches of the same original sect as in Dauphine, were, from a noted preacher, called Josephists; in Languedoc they were called Henricians; and in other provinces, from Peter Bruys, they were called Petrobusians. Sometimes they received their name from their manners, as 'Catharists' [*Puritans*]; and, from the foreign country whence it was presumed they had been expelled, they were called 'Bulgarians,' or Baugres. In Italy they were commonly called *Fratricelli*; that is, 'men of the brotherhood;' because they cultivated brotherly love among themselves, acknowledging one another as brethren in Christ. Sometimes they were denominated 'Paulicians,' and by corruption of the word, 'Publicans,' considering them as sprung from that ancient sect, which, in the seventh century, spread over Armenia and Thrace, and which, when persecuted by the Greek emperor, might migrate into Europe, and mingle with the Waldenses in Piedmont. Sometimes they were named from the country or city in which they prevaled as Lombardists, Toulousians, Albigenses. *These branches*, however, *all sprang from one common stock*, and were animated by the same religious and moral principles.

"Albigenses became latterly their common name in *France*, from the great numbers of them that inhabited the city of *Abby*, and the district of Albigeais, between the Garonne and the Rhone: but that name was not general and confirmed till after the council of Abby, in the year 1254, which condemned them as heretics. * * * Some writers have labored to prove that the Waldenses and Albigenses were quite different classes of

Christians, and that they held different principles and opinions; but there seems no solid ground for maintaining such a distinction. When the *Popes* issued their fulminations against the *Albigenses*, they expressly condemn them *as Waldenses;* their legates made war against them as professing the faith of the Waldenses; the monks of the inquisition formed their processes of indictment against them as being Waldenses; the people persecuted them as such; and they uniformly adopted the title when it was given them, and even thought themselves honored by it. * * * Farther, the provincial councils of Toulouse, in 1119, and of Lombez, in 1176, and the general councils of Lateran, in 1139 and 1176, do not treat of them nor condemn them as Albigenses, but as heretics; and when they particularize them they denominate them '*bons homet*' (*i. e.*, good men), '*Cathari*,' '*Paterini*,' '*Publicani*,' &c., which shows that they existed before they were generally known as Albigenses. It is also proved from their books that they existed as Waldenses before the times of Peter Waldo, who preached about the year 1160. Perrin, who wrote their history, had in his possession a New Testament in the Vallese language, written on parchment, in a very ancient letter, and a book entitled, in their language, '*Qual cosa sia l'Antichrist;*' that is, *What is Antichrist?* under date of the year 1120, which carries us back at least twenty years before Waldo.

"Another book, entitled *The Noble Lesson*, is dated A. D. 1100. Their enemies confirm their great antiquity. Reinerius Saccho, an inquisitor, and one of their most implacable enemies, who lived only eighty years after Waldo, admits that the Waldenses flourished *five hundred years before that preacher.* Gretzer, the Jesuit, who also wrote against the Waldenses, and had examined the subject fully, not only admits their great antiquity, but declares his firm belief, 'that the Toulousians and Albigenses condemned in the years 1177 and 1178 were no other than Waldenses.' In fact, their doctrine, discipline, gov-

ernment, manners, and even the errors with which they have been charged (by the Catholics) show that the Albigenses and Waldenses were distinct branches of the same sect, or that the former were sprung from the latter.* * * *

"Of the Catharists in Germany, and of the Paterines in the duchy of Milan, &c., during this period, both of which held the same principles as the Waldenses, we have already taken some notice in the preceding chapter. But it was not till the twelfth century that the *Vaudois* appear in ecclesiastical history as a people obnoxious to the Church of Rome. * * * The following is the account which Mr. Robinson gives of this intricate article of ecclesiastical history (of the Leonists), and as it appears to myself more probable than any other that I have seen, I incline to admit it as the true one.

"'In the twelfth century, toward the close, a great reformation was begun at Lyons under the auspices of a merchant there, who procured a translation of the four Gospels from Latin into French, and who both preached in person, and engaged others to do so in various parts of the country. Reinerius Saccho thought all the believers [Credenti] sprung from this stock, and he therefore calls them Leonists. Whether the merchant received his name [Valdus] from the Vaudois, or whether they received theirs from him, is uncertain. The former is the more probable opinion of the two, and the fact seems to be, that till then the Vaudois were, comparatively speaking, few and obscure, and the Leonists at once numerous and popular; that the Vaudois and Leonists soon incorporated themselves together; that the Vaudois communicated their name, which passed for that of a low, rustical, and obscure people to the Leonists; and that the Leonists emboldened the Vaudois to separate openly from the Church. This view of things in part reconciles the opinion of the Catholic bishop, Bossuet, with that of Dr. Allix and other Protestants. Bossuet says, the separation of the Vaudois was for a long time

*Dr. Rankin's History of France, vol. III., pp. 198–202.

a mere schism in the Church, and that Waldo was their parent. Protestants deny this, and say that the Vaudois were the parents of the Leonists. It would seem the Vaudois were the first, and that they continued in the Church a sort of party till Waldo emboldened them to separate, and so became, not the founder of the party, but the parent of their separation. * * * The Latin Vulgate Bible was the only edition of the Scriptures at that time in Europe: but that language was inaccessible to all, except one in a hundred of its inhabitants. Happily for Waldo, his situation in life had enabled him to surmount that obstacle. "Being somewhat learned," says Reinerius Saccho, when speaking of him, "he taught the people the text of the New Testament in their mother tongue. * * * As Waldo became more acquainted with the Scriptures he began to discover that a multiplicity of doctrines, rites, and ceremonies, which had been introduced into the *national religion*, had not only no foundation in the Word of God, but were most *pointedly condemned* in that book. Inflamed with zeal for the glory of God on the one hand, and with concern for the souls of his fellow-sinners on the other, he raised his voice loudly against them, condemning the arrogance of the Pope, and the reigning vices of the clergy. * * * He taught the truth in its simplicity, and enforced its practical influence on the heart and life; and, by his own example, as well as by an appeal to the lives of those who first believed in Christ, he labored to demonstrate the great difference that existed between the Christianity of the Bible, and that of the Church of Rome. * * * Pope Alexander III. no sooner heard of such heretical proceedings than he anathematized the reformer and his adherents, commanding the archbishop to proceed against them with the utmost rigor. Waldo was now compelled to quit Lyons. His flock in a great measure followed their pastor; and hence a dispersion took place not unlike that which arose in the Church of Jerusalem on the occasion of the death of Stephen. The effects were also sim-

ilar. Waldo himself retired into Dauphiny, where he preached with abundant success. His principles took deep and lasting root, and produced a numerous harvest of disciples, who were denominated Leonists, Vaudois, Albigenses, or Waldenses; for the very same class of Christians is designated by these various appellations at different times, and according to the different countries, or quarters of the same country, in which they appeared."'*

"Persecuted from place to place, Waldo retired into Picardy, where also success attended his labors. Driven from thence, he proceeded into Germany, carrying along with him the glad tidings of salvation; and, according to the testimony of Thuanus, a very authentic French historian, he at length settled in Bohemia, where he finished his course in the year 1179, after a ministry of nearly twenty years. * * * The persecution of Waldo and his followers, with their flight from Lyons, is a remarkable epoch in the annals of the Christian Church. Wherever they went they sowed the seeds of Reformation. The countenance and blessings of the King of kings accompanied them. The Word of God grew and multiplied, not only in the places where Waldo himself had planted it, but in more distant regions. In Alsace, and along the Rhine, the doctrines of Waldo spread extensively. Persecutions ensued. * * * The inquisition had not yet been established, but council after council had been convened in France, and, about twenty years after Waldo had been driven from Lyons, the following persecuting edict was issued from Rome:

"'THE DECREE OF POPE LUCIUS III. AGAINST HERETICS: A. D. 1181.

"'To abolish the malignity of diverse heresies which are lately sprung up in most parts of the world, it is but fitting that

*Perrin's History, ch. 1.

the power committed to the Church should be awakened, that by the concurring assistance of the Imperial strength, both the insolence and malpertness of the heretics in their false designs may be crushed, and the truth of Catholic simplicity shining forth in the Holy Church, may demonstrate her pure and free from the execrableness of their false doctrines. Wherefore we, being supported by the presence and power of our most dear son Frederic, the most illustrious emperor of the Romans, * * * do set ourselves against these heretics who have got different names from the several false doctrines they profess, and, by the sanction of this present general decree, and by our apostolical authority according to the tenor of these presents, we condemn all manner of heresy, by what name soever it may be denominated.

"'More particularly, we declare all Catharists, Paterines, and those who call themselves "The Poor of Lyons;" the Passignes, Josephists, Arnoldists, to lie under a perpetual anathema. * * * We therefore include under the same sentence of a perpetual anathema all those who, either being forbid or not sent, do notwithstanding presume to preach publicly or privately without any authority received either from the apostolic See, or from the bishops of their respective dioceses; as also all those who are not afraid to hold or teach any opinions concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, baptism, the remission of sins, matrimony, or any other sacraments of the Church, differing from what the Holy Church of Rome doth preach and observe; and generally all those whom the same Church of Rome, or the several bishops in their dioceses, with the advice of their clergy, or the clergy themselves in case of a vacancy of the See, with the advice, if need be, of neighboring bishops, shall judge to be heretics. * * * And we further decree, that this excommunication, in which our will is that all heretics be included, shall be repeated and renewed by all patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, in ALL THE CHIEF

FESTIVALS, and on any public solemnity, or upon any other occasion, to the glory of God and the putting a stop to all heretical pravity; ordering, by our apostolical authority, that if any bishop be found wanting or slow herein, he be suspended for three years from his episcopal dignity and administration.

"'Furthermore, with the council and advice of bishops, and intimation of the emperor and princes of the empire, we do add, that every archbishop or bishop, either in his own person, or by his archdeacon, or by other honest and fit persons, shall once or twice in the year visit the parish in which it is reported that the heretics dwell, and there cause two or three men of good credit, or, if need be, the whole neighborhood, to swear that if they know of any heretics there, or any that frequent private meetings, or that differ from the common conversation of mankind, either in life or manners, they will signify the same to the bishop or archdeacon. The bishops, also, or archdeacon shall summon before them the parties accused, who, unless they, at their discretion, according to the custom of their country, do clear themselves of the guilt laid to their charge—or if, after having so cleared themselves, they relapse again to their former unbelief, they shall be punished at the bishop's discretion. And if any of them, by a damnable superstition, shall refuse to swear, that alone shall suffice to convict them of being heretics, and liable to the punishments before mentioned.'

"Idlefonsus, king of Arragon, also testified his zeal against the Waldenses by an edict published in the year 1194, which reads: 'Forasmuch as it has pleased God to set us over his people, it is but fit and just that, according to our might, we should be continually solicitious for the welfare and defense of the same; wherefore we, in imitation of our ancestors, and in obedience to the canons which determine and ordain heretics, as persons cast out from the sight of God and all Catholics, to be condemned and persecuted everywhere, do command and charge that the Waldenses, Inzabbati, who otherwise are called

"The Poor of Lyons," and all other heretics who *cannot be numbered*, being excommunicated from the Holy Church, adversaries to the cross of Christ, violators and corrupters of the Christian religion, and the avowed enemies of us and our kingdom, to depart out of our kingdom and all our dominions. Whosoever, therefore, from this day forward, shall presume to receive the said Waldenses and Inzabbati, or any other heretics of whatsoever profession, into their houses, or to be present at their pernicious sermons, or to afford them meat, or any other favor, shall thereby incur the indignation of Almighty God, as well as ours, and have his goods confiscated without the remedy of an appeal, and be punished as if he were actually guilty of high treason. And we strictly charge and command, that this our edict and perpetual constitution be publicly read on the LORD'S DAYS, by bishops and other rectors of Churches, in all the cities, castles, and towns of our kingdom, and throughout all our dominions; and that the same be observed by vicars, bailiffs, justices, &c., and all the people in general, and that the aforesaid punishment be inflicted on all transgressors.'

"It is intended, in this and the two following sections, to lay before the reader a more detailed account of the principles and practices of the Waldenses than hath hitherto been given; and there appears no method of doing this more satisfactorily than by first hearing the charges alleged against them by their adversaries of the Romish Church, and then attending to the apologies, reasonings, and confessions of faith, which, from time to time, the ever-laudable principle of self-defense necessarily extorted from them. * * * Reinerius Saccho, whose name I have had occasion more than once to mention, was, for seventeen years of the earlier part of his life, in some way or other connected with the Waldenses; but he apostatized from their profession, entered the Catholic Church, was raised in it to the dignified station of an inqusitor, and became one of their most cruel persecutors. He was deputed by the Pope to reside in

Lombardy, in the south of France; and about the year 1250, published a catalogue of the errors of the Waldenses, under three and thirty distinct heads. The reader who wishes to pursue the original Latin, may find it in Dr. Allix's *Remarks upon the Churches of Piedmont*, pp. 188–191. The following is a faithful translation:

"'Their first error,' says he, 'is a *contempt of ecclesiastical power;* and from thence they have been delivered up to Satan, and by him cast headlong into innumerable errors, mixing the erroneous doctrines of the heretics of old with their own inventions. And being cast out of the Catholic Church, they affirm that they alone are the Church of Christ and his disciples. They declare themselves to be the APOSTLES' SUCCESSORS, to have apostolical authority, and the keys of binding and loosing. THEY HOLD THE CHURCH OF ROME TO BE THE WHORE OF BABYLON (Rev. 17), and that all who obey her are damned, especially the clergy that have been subject to her *since the time of* POPE SYLVESTER.* * * * They hold that *none* of the ordinances of the [Catholic] Church which have been introduced since Christ's ascension ought to be observed, as being of no value. The feasts, fasts, orders, blessings, offices of the Church, and the like, they utterly reject. * * * Some of them hold that baptism is of no advantage to infants because they cannot actually believe. * * * They do not believe the body and blood of Christ to be the true sacrament, but only blessed bread, which, by a figure only, is called the body of Christ, even as it is said, "and the rock was Christ." * * * This sacrament they celebrate in their assemblies, repeating the words of the Gospel at their table, and participating together, in imitation of Christ's supper. * * * They deride all the festivals which we celebrate in honor of the saints, and all other instances of our veneration for them. Accordingly, wher-

*This pontiff was bishop of Rome in the days of Constantine the Great, about the year 330.

ever they can do it, they secretly work upon [Romish] holy days, arguing that since working is good it cannot be evil to do that which is good on a holy day. They do not observe Lent, or other fasts of the Church, alleging that God does not delight in the afflictions of his friends, as being able to save without them. * * * They do not receive the Old Testament, but the Gospel only, that they may not be overthrown by it, but rather be able to defend themselves therewith; pretending that upon the introduction of the Gospel Dispensation all old things were to be laid aside. * * * They select the choicest sayings and authorities of the holy Fathers, such as Augustine, Jerom, Gregory, Chrysostom, and Isidore, that with them they may support their opinions, oppose others, or the more easily seduce the simple, by varnishing over their sacriligious doctrine with the good sentences of the saints, at the same time very quietly passing over those parts of the writings of the holy fathers that oppose and confute their errors.'

"Such is the view which Reinerious gave of the principles of the Waldenses, about eighty years subsequent to the times of Peter Waldo; and we must understand this description as applicable to one general class of Christians, scattered throughout the south of France, the valleys of the Pyrenean mountains, the valleys of Piedmont, and the country of the Milanese, though probably distinguished in different places by the different names of Puritans, or Catharists, Paterines, Arnoldists, Leonists, Albigenses, or Waldenses, the last of which ultimately became their more general appellation. * * * Peter Waldo, after disseminating his doctrines in France and Germany, was at length driven into Bohemia, where he spent the last years of his life in preaching the Gospel, which he did with the most astonishing success. That kingdom comprehended what is now included in the duchy of Silesia, and the marquisate of Moravia. The country is about three hundred miles long, and two hundred and fifty broad, almost wholly surrounded with impene-

trable forests and lofty mountains. The soil where it is cultivated, is fruitful, and yields corn enough for the use of its inhabitants, which are computed at three millions in number. * * *

"Cranty, who wrote the history of the Bohemian brethren, mentions a colony of Waldenses as obtaining permission to settle at Saltz, and Lun, on the river Eger, so early as the twelfth century, which the coincidence of time renders it highly probable refers to the persecuted Waldo and his brethren. Certain it is that his labors were crowned with great success in that country; and we have two noted authors who have left us a particular account of the faith and practices of the Waldenses in Bohemia during the fourteenth century, at which time their numbers had increased very considerably, and they had to sustain the fire of Papal persecution. The first is an inquisitor of the Church of Rome, who says '*he had exact knowledge of the Waldenses*,' at whose trials he had often assisted, in several countries. The other is Æneas Sylvius, who wrote the history of Bohemia, and afterward ascended the Pontifical Chair, with the title of Pope Pius II. Thus writes the inquisitor concerning the Waldenses of Bohemia. The first error of the Waldenses, says he, is, that they affirm the Church of Rome is not the Church of Jesus Christ, but an assembly of UNGODLY MEN, and that she has *ceased* from being the *true* Church from *the time of* POPE SYLVESTER, *at which time the poison of temporal advantages was cast into the Church*—that all vices and sins reign in that Church, and that *they* alone live righteously—that they are the true Church of Christ, and that the Church of Rome is the whore mentioned in the Revelation. They despise and reject all the ordinances and statutes of the Church, as being too many and very burdensome. They insist that the Pope is the head and leader of all error—that the prelates are the Scribes and seemingly religious Pharisees. * * * They condemn all ecclesiastical offices, and the privileges and immu-

nities of the Church, and all persons and things belonging to it, such as councils and synods, parochial rights, &c., declaring that the observances of the religions are nothing else than Pharisaical traditions. As to the second class of their errors, they condemn all the sacraments of the [Catholic] Church. * * * Concerning the eucharist, they say that a wicked priest cannot celebrate that sacrament, that transubstantiation is not performed by the hands of him who celebrates it unworthily, and that it [the eucharist] may be celebrated on our common tables, alleging for this the words of Malachi 1: 11, 'In every place shall a pure offering be offered to my name.' They condemn the custom of believers communicating no more than once a year, whereas they communicate daily.* * * *

"Their third class of errors is as follows: They contemn all approved ecclesiastical customs which they do not read of in the Gospel, such as the observation of Candlemas, Palm Sunday, the reconciliation of penitents and the adoration of the cross on Good Friday. They despise the feast of Easter, and all other festivals of Christ and the saints, and say that one day is as good as another, working upon [Romish] holy days where they can do it without being taken notice of. They disregard the Church fasts, alleging Isaiah 58: 'Is this the fast that I have chosen?' They celebrate the eucharist in their household cups, and say that the *corporeal*, or cloth on which the host is laid, is no holier than the cloth of their breeches.† * * * Thus far the testimony of this inquisitor, to which I shall now subjoin the short account which the celebrated Æneas Sylvius gives of the Waldenses of Bohemia in his history of that kingdom.

*I suspect this should have been every LORD'S DAY, or first day of the week; for it is certain they did not come together for worship *every day*, nor indeed was the thing practicable. (Jones.)

†Hist. Script. Bohem., p. 222, *et seq.* in Dr. Allix's *Remarks*, p. 211–219.

"They hold, says he, that the Pope of Rome is not superior to bishops, and that there is no difference (as to rank or dignity), for that grace and virtue alone give the preference. * * * It is to no purpose to spend one's time in singing and saying the canonical hours—*that we are to cease from working on no day* EXCEPT THE LORD'S DAY—that the *holidays* of saints are *to be rejected*—and that there is no merit in observing the fasts instituted by the [Catholic] Church.*

"Claudius Seisselius was archbishop of Turin toward the close of the fifteenth century, a little before the time of the Reformation, and wrote a treatise against the Waldenses. His residence in the very heart of the valleys of Piedmont must have furnished him with the very best opportunities of becoming acquainted with the principles and practices of his non-conformist neighbors, and he has transmitted to posterity a narrative sufficiently circumstantial and explicit to enable any impartial person to form a tolerably correct judgment of them. His testimony is, therefore, of too much importance to be omitted. But I must entreat the reader to bear in mind that it is the testimony of an adversary, whose Papal zeal he will perceive to blaze forth against them occasionally with no little fury. Alluding to the Churches of the Waldenses in Piedmont, and those scattered throughout the diocese of Italy, he tells us that the most cruel persecutions had not been able to extirpate them, or hinder them from a constant defense of that doctrine which they had received from their ancestors. 'All sorts of people,' says he, 'have repeatedly endeavored, but in vain, to root them out; for even yet, contrary to the opinion of all men, they still remain conquerors, or at least wholly invincible.' He then proceeds thus to describe them. 'The Pope of Rome, and the rest of the prelates and priests of that Church, these Waldenses affirm, neither follow the life nor the precepts of Christ, but do quite the contrary.'

*Hist. Bohem., p. 141, *ubi supra.*

"Such is the description given us, by the archbishop of Turin, of the Waldenses of Piedmont, *before Luther was born, or Calvin thought of, or the term of reformation even mentioned.* And yet the Catholics have had the affrontery to ask us, 'Where was your religion before Luther?' But let us further attend to the account which he gives us of the articles of their faith. On this particular he thus writes:

"'They receive only what is written in the Old and New Testaments. They say that the popes of Rome and other priests have corrupted the Scriptures by their doctrines and glosses. * * * They do not celebrate the festivals of the saints. * * * They say that they alone observe the evangelical and apostolic doctrine, on which account, *by an intolerable impudence*, they usurp the name of the Catholic! Their barbs [pastors] do greatly err,' saith Seisselius, 'because they are neither sent of God, nor by the pastors of the [Catholic] Church, but of the devil, *as appears from their damnable doctrine.* * * * They detest and abhor all images, and the sign of the cross, much more than we honor them.'

"Having in the former section laid before the reader the sentiments imputed to the Waldenses by four of their avowed adversaries, there can be no reasonable objection to our now permitting them to make their own apology. Their historian, John Paul Perrin, in his *Histoire des Vaudois*, published at Geneva, in 1619, has furnished us with two of their 'Confessions of Faith,' of which the following are faithful translations. Sir Samuel Moreland has fixed the date of the first of them in the year 1120.*

"'THE CONFESSION OF FAITH OF THE WALDENSES.

"'1. We believe and firmly maintain all that is contained in the twelve articles of the symbol, commonly called the Apostles' Creed, and we regard as heretical whatever is inconsistent with the said twelve articles. * * *

*Moreland's Hist. of the Churches of Piedmont, p. 30.

"'3. We acknowledge for sacred canonical Scriptures the books of the Holy Bible. [Here follows the title of each, exactly conformable to our received canon, but which it is deemed, on that account, quite unnecessary to particularize.] * * *

"'5. That Christ had been promised to the Fathers who received the law, to the end that, knowing their sin by the law, and their unrighteousness and insufficiency, they might desire the coming of Christ to make satisfaction for their sins, and to accomplish the law by himself. * * *

"'7. That Christ is our Life, and Truth, and Peace, and Righteousness; our Shepherd and Advocate, our Sacrifice, and Priest, who died for the salvation of all who should believe, and rose again for their justification.

"'8. And we also firmly believe that there is no other mediator or advocate with God the Father but Jesus Christ. * * *

"'10. Moreover, we have ever regarded all the inventions of men (in the affairs of religion) as an unspeakable abomination before God—such as the festival days and vigils of saints, and what is called holy water, the abstaining from flesh on certain days, and such like things, but, above all, the masses. * * *

"'13. We acknowledge no sacraments (as of Divine appointment) but baptism and the Lord's Supper.'* * * *

"'ANOTHER CONFESSION OF FAITH.

"'*The Church of Rome is the whore of Babylon.*

"'We must not obey the Pope and bishops, because they are the wolves of the Church of Christ. * * *

"'That is the Church of Christ, which hears the pure doctrine of Christ and observes the ordinances instituted by him, in whatsoever place it exists. * * *

"'So many orders (of the clergy) are so many MARKS OF THE BEAST. * * *

*Perrin's Hist. des Vaudois, ch. 12.

"'THIRD CONFESSION.

"'3. We believe in the Holy Spirit as the Comforter, proceeding from the Father, and from the Son; by whose inspiration we are taught to pray, being by him renewed in the spirit of our minds: who creates us anew into good works, and from whom we receive the knowledge of the truth.

"'4. We believe that there is one Holy Church, comprising the whole assembly of the elect and faithful that have existed from the beginning of the world, or that shall be to the end thereof. Of this Church the Lord Jesus Christ is the Head. It is governed by his Word and guided by the Holy Spirit. * * *

"'6. We acknowledge that kings, princes, and governors are the appointed and established ministers of God, whom we are bound to obey (in all lawful and civil concerns). For they bear the sword for the defense of the innocent, and the punishment of evil doers, for which reason we are bound to honor and pay them tribute. From this power and authority no man can exempt himself, as is manifest from the example of the Lord Jesus Christ, who voluntarily paid tribute, not taking upon himself any jurisdiction of temporal power. * * *

"'11. On the other hand, we confess that we consider it to be our duty to beware of false teachers, whose object is to divert the minds of men from the true worship of God, and to lead them to place their confidence in the creature, as well as to depart from the good works of the Gospel, and to regard the inventions of men.

"'12. We take the Old and the New Testament for the rule of our life, and we agree with the general confession of faith contained in (what is usually termed) the Apostles' Creed.'* (pp. 230–251.)

"Louis XII., king of France, being informed by the enemies of the Waldenses inhabiting a part of the province of Provence

*See Perrin's Hist. des Vaudois, ch. 42.

that several heinous crimes were laid to their account, sent the master of requests, and a certain doctor of the Sorbonne, who was confessor to his Majesty, to make inquiry into this matter. On their return, they reported that they had visited all the parishes where they dwelt, had inspected their places of worship, but that they had found no images, nor signs of the ornaments belonging to the mass, nor any of the ceremonies of the Romish Church; much less could they discover any traces of those crimes with which they were charged. On the contrary, *they kept the Sabbath-day* [LORD'S DAY], observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive Church, instructed their children in the articles of the Christian faith and the commandments of God. The king having heard the report of his commissioners, said with an oath, that they were better men than himself or his people.* * * *

"I shall now lay before the reader a still more interesting document. It is the testimony which is borne to these people by that eminent historian, Thuanus—an enemy, indeed, to the Waldenses, himself being a Catholic; but he was, nevertheless, a fair and candid one. Quoting the words of Guy de Perpignan, bishop of Elna, in Roussillon, who exercised the office of inquisitor against the Waldenses, he informs us that 'their fixed opinions are said to be these: that the Church of Rome, because she hath renounced the true faith of Christ, is the whore of Babylon, and that barren tree which Christ himself hath cursed and commanded to be rooted up—therefore we must by no means obey the pope and the bishops who cherish his errors; that the monastic life is the sink of the Church and a hellish institution; its vows are vain, and subservient only to the filthy love of boys; the orders of the presbytery are the marks of the great beast mentioned in the Apocalypse. * * * Poor as they are, they are content, and live in a state of seclusion from the rest of mankind. One thing is very remarkable, that per-

*Vesembecius' Oration on the Waldenses, in Perrin, ch. 5

sons externally so savage and rude should have so much more cultivation. They can all read and write. They know French sufficiently for the understanding of the Bible and the singing of Psalms. You can scarcely find a boy among them who cannot give you an intelligent account of the faith which they profess. In this, indeed, they resemble their brethren of the other valleys.' * * *

"But of all the Catholic writers who have treated of the Waldenses, there is none whose testimony is more important than that of Reinerius Saccho. He had himself been one of their number, and consequently could speak of them from personal knowledge. He had apostatized from their profession, was 'by merit raised to the bad eminence' of an inquisitor in the Catholic Church, and of course was become one of their bitterest persecutors. He wrote a book against them (A. D. 1258), from which I have already quoted largely in a former section. But that extract is almost wholly confined to an enumeration of the articles on which they did not agree with the Catholic Church. Let the reader now remark his unbought testimony in their favor.

"'Of all the sects that have risen up against the Church of Rome,' says he, 'the Waldenses have been the most prejudicial and pernicious, inasmuch as their opposition has been of very long continuance. Add to which, that this sect is become very general, for there is scarcely a country to be found in which this heresy is not planted. And, in the third place, because while all other sects beget in people a dread and horror of them on account of their blasphemies against God, this, on the contrary, hath a great appearance of godliness; for they live righteously before men, believe rightly concerning God in every particular, holding all the articles contained in the [Apostles'] Creed, but hating and reviling the Church of Rome, and on this subject they are readily believed by the people.'* * * *

*Reinerius *contra* Waldenses, in Perrin, b. 2, ch. 1.

Among us, women teach as well as men, and one disciple, as soon as he is informed himself, teaches another. Among them [Catholics] you can hardly find a doctor who can repeat three chapters of the New Testament by heart; but of us, there is scarcely man or woman who doth not retain the whole. And because we are all sincere believers in Christ, and all teach and enforce a holy life and conversation, these Scribes and Pharisees persecute us to death, as their predecessors did Jesus Christ.'* * * * The first editor of the complete book of Reinerius was father Gretzer, who published it in the year 1613. In the margin of that work, opposite the passage above quoted, he has placed these words: 'This is a true picture of the heretics of our age, particularly of the Anabaptists.' There are few of the Baptists of the present day, it is to be hoped, who would blush to own an alliance with either the old Waldensian preachers or the heretical Baptists referred to by this father of the Catholic Church, at least in this part of their conduct; and, indeed, it would be well if all our missionaries and private Christians of the present day were as conversant with the Word of God as the Waldenses even in that dark age appear, from the testimony of their very enemies, to have been.

"Monsieur de Vignaux, who was forty years pastor of one of the Churches of the Waldenses, in the valleys of Piedmont, and died at the age of eighty, wrote a treatise concerning their life, manners, and religion, in which he says: 'We live in peace and harmony one with another, have intercourse and dealings chiefly among ourselves, *having never mingled ourselves* with the members of the Church of Rome by marrying our sons to their daughters, nor our daughters to their sons. Yet they are so pleased with our manners and customs that Catholics, both lords and others, would rather have men- and maid-servants from among us, than from those of their own religion; and they actu-

*Reineri, cap. 8, *Quomodo se ingerant familiuritati magnorum.*

ally come from distant parts to seek nurses among us for their little children, finding, as they say, more fidelity among our people than their own.' He then gives a summary of their doctrinal principles, for the sake of which they have been persecuted, such as, 'that the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to our salvation, and that we are called to believe only what they teach, without any regard to the authority of man—that nothing else ought to be received by us except what God hath commanded—that there is only one mediator between God and man, and consequently that it is wrong to invoke the saints—that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the only standing ordinances in the Church of Christ—that all masses are damnable, and ought to be abolished—that all human traditions are to be rejected—that the saying and recital of the office, fasts confined to particular days, superfluous holy-days, differences of meats, so many degrees and orders of priests, monks, and nuns, so many benedictions and consecrations of creatures, vows, pilgrimages, and the whole vast and confused mass of ceremonies, formerly invented, ought to be abolished. They deny the supremacy of the Pope, and more especially the power that he has usurped over the civil government, and admit of no other degrees than bishops and deacons. They contend that the See of Rome is the true Babylon—the marriage of the clergy lawful—and that the true Church of Christ consists of those who hear the Word of God and believe it.'* * * *

"To these numerous testimonies I shall now add that of our great poet Milton, who seems to have diligently studied the character of the Waldenses, and to have well understood their principles, and the constitution of their Churches. 'The Waldenses, our first reformers, both from the Scriptures and primitive example, maintained those among them who bore the office of ministers by alms alone. Take their very words: "Our food and clothing are sufficiently administered and given to us

*Perrin's Hist., b. 1, ch. 6.

by way of gratuity and alms, by the good people whom we teach." As for Church endowments and possessions, I meet with none considerable before Constantine but the houses and gardens where they met, and their places of burial; and I persuade myself that from thence the ancient Waldenses, whom I deservedly cite so often, held that "to endow Churches is an evil thing," and that the Church then fell off and became the whore, sitting on that beast mentioned in the book of Revelation, when, under POPE SYLVESTER, she received those temporal donations. So the forecited Tractate of their doctrine testifies.' Thus far Milton. * * * But Milton is not singular in the commendation that he has given to the confessors of Piedmont, for thus writes the candid Jortin, in perfect consistency with our great poet: 'The *Waldenses* taught that the Roman Church *departed from its former sanctity and purity in the time of Constantine the Great;* they therefore *refused to submit* to the usurped powers of its pontiff.'"* (pp. 260–266.)

The attentive reader will observe by the foregoing extracts from Jones' History, that the true Church of Christ—or the Waldenses—and the Church of Rome, were *always distinct and separate bodies,* from the days of "Pope Sylvester," and Constantine, until the Reformation. Now the question arises: Did the Waldenses observe the seventh day of the week for the Sabbath, or did they observe the *first day?* We have found in the above from Jones, the Waldenses saying:

"We are to cease from working on NO day EXCEPT the LORD'S DAY—that the holidays of saints are to be rejected—and that there is no merit in observing the fasts instituted by the Church [of Rome]." (Hist., p. 245.)

*Remarks on Eccles. Hist., vol. III., p. 303.

Again, on p. 260, Jones says:

"They kept the *Sabbath-day*, observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive Church, instructed their children in the articles of the Christian faith and the *commandments of God.*"

From these statements we may arrive at this just conclusion, namely: if the true Church "*ceased from working on no day except the* LORD'S DAY;" then, when it is said, "They kept *the Sabbath-day*," it must be understood that their "Sabbath-day" was the "LORD'S DAY," or the first day of the week.

But again, we justly infer that the Waldenses, or true Church, did keep the *first-day* Sabbath, from the following consdierations: (1) The Romish Church did always oppose the Waldenses in everything in which they were not agreed. (2) The Waldenses, in turn, opposed the Romish Church in all things about which they disagreed. (3) We do not find that the Romish Church ever opposed the Waldenses for keeping the *seventh day;* neither do we find the Waldenses opposing the Church of Rome for keeping the *first day* of the week, only as a *superstitious festival.* Hence, the conclusion is just, that the Waldenses did keep the *first-day* Sabbath, in accordance with "*the commandments of God,*" as quoted above. In view of these facts, showing that the true Church, or Waldenses, were always a distinct, or separate people from the Church of Rome, from the days of Constantine and Pope Sylvester, how could J. N. Andrews

say, in his pretended *History of the Sabbath* (pp. 259–60), that "to Constantine and to Sylvester, therefore, the advocates of first day observance are greatly indebted. The one elevated it as a heathen festival to the throne of the empire, making it a day of rest from most kinds of business: the other changed it to a Christian institution, giving it the dignified appellation of Lord's day?" What confidence can one place in the statements of such a writer as this?

REVIEW OF "BOTH SIDES."

The articles which compose the first part of these pages (now revised) were first published in the *World's Crisis*. Uriah Smith then replied to them, and the whole was published under the title of *Both Sides*. The following is my review.

REVIEW.

"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him." (Prov. 18: 17.)

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO "SIDES."

The whole amount of matter as written by me, and first published in the *Crisis*, and then republished as appears in *Both Sides*, will be found to be about fifty-four pages; and about *twenty pages* of it are quotations from the Scriptures. But in the "reply" there is so much of human reasoning, assertion, etc., that my opponent has swelled *his side* to about one hundred and seventy pages! and only about *five pages* of it are quotations from the Scriptures! and *twenty-eight* lines of this are on the subject of *washing feet!* (See *Both Sides*, p. 85.)

This shows that *Both Sides* contains one hundred and sixteen pages more than is found in my arguments; and yet about *sixteen pages less* of Scripture are quoted. How shall we account for all this? My opponent may answer for himself. Let us now, for a few moments, see how such an amount of Scripture as quoted by me in favor of the first-day Sab-

bath affected my reviewer. On p. 50 of *Both Sides* he says, the "tendency of these quotations can be nothing less than to worry the reader into complete bewilderment." And yet only four lines below, he calls these "consecutive Scriptures." What does "consecutive" mean? Webster gives the definition thus: "Following in a train; succeeding one another in a regular order," etc. And is it so, as my opponent says, that "consecutive Scripture" has a tendency to "worry" him into "complete bewilderment?" We are sorry for him. It would appear from his own confession that he is hardly able to fill with "honor" the important station of editor of a religious paper, and a reviewer of important theological questions.

A CHAPTER OF QUOTATIONS.

The following extracts of phrases, accusations, criminations, and denunciations, which I have taken from *Both Sides*, I do not intend to imitate, neither do I intend to take any other notice of the most of them than simply to repeat them in this chapter, for the reflection of their author, and for others to decide for themselves how much refinement, logic, or Christian courtesy they contain; or what force they have in doing away with the arguments in favor of the first-day Sabbath.

"Stale and incessant clamor—it is a pity that men

should take such derogatory views of our Savior and his mission, as to suppose that he came down to do the unnecessary, yea, blasphemous work of dying to abolish his Father's law—one of the flimsiest objections against the Sabbath that ever issued from the realms of darkness—Eld. P. is guilty—land him in the deepest bogs of atheism—covertly insinuating—the only loop-hole of escape—you make Christ the minister of sin, and grant the wicked license for his wickedness—Eld. P. seems to have become somewhat bewildered—borders hard on nonsense—was it a sense of relief in view of being free from the restraints of law that led to that fervent ejaculation of praise? If so, we are led to fear that the idea of obedience is irksome to him [Preble], and that the love through which God designs that all his service shall be prompted, is not found in his heart—who could measure the presumption of such a course, or fathom the degree of insult it is offering to God, and his Son, Jesus Christ—Eld. P., leave this matter of arguing for, or granting indulgences, to the 'Mother of Harlots;' it is unbecoming a Protestant and a Christian—Eld. P., is such the character of the God with whom we have to do—fighting a man of straw of your own creation—Eld. P.'s reasoning is altogether based on assumption—we shall understand him, shall we not, that we need no longer refrain from having other gods, making graven images, taking God's name in vain, breaking the Sabbath, and

violating the other six commandments which regulate our duty to our fellow-men—guilty of a style of reasoning that is exceedingly shallow—Eld. P. was so blind—those who choose to follow the teachings of the '*Mother of Harlots*,' instead of following Christ and the apostles, will probably teach the first-day Sabbath—another bundle of fallacies—india-rubber modes of argument—dust and confusion raised—make Paul the merest simpleton—O shameful confusion! O Egyptian darkness—the old red cow—it is not a little surprising that Eld. P., while so strenuously professing to be a follower of the teachings of the 'living Jesus,' should so soon join issue with his teachings, endeavor to explain away his words, and avoid obedience to his plain and explicit requirements—Eld. P. is not following the living Jesus in his adherence to Sunday—we need say no more to cause such assertions to recoil with terrible severity upon the head of their author—simply daubing their wall with untempered mortar, and constructing a refuge of lies—most specious and insidious—marvelous obtuseness—he has stumbled into the truth—cannibalism—revolved at every step in utter contradiction—ghostly visions—haunt Eld. P.—Oh! the infinite presumption of the thought! Vain man! Mount up to heaven, drive the angels from your august presence, burst into the heavenly temple, remove Christ, dethrone Jehovah, clothe yourself with omnipotence, and *then* change that holy law! but

never before that, never—huge preparations to demolish a man of straw—may the Lord have mercy on those who will not receive his law, because it is *not* stamped with imperfections far exceeding anything that ever yet attached to human enactments—there are thousands of lawless villians all over the land who from the blackness of their hearts would rejoice at the reasoning of Eld. P.—his chivalrous attacks upon his man of straw—no-law-of-God theory—absolutely ludicrous—perhaps the other new regulations will permit us to worship graven images, swear, kill, lie, and steal at least a little—fossil remains of a few contemptible forgeries—most barefaced forgery of all—the very ink should blush—not a word of truth in it—choose to follow the 'Mother of Harlots,' will bow to the offspring of Paganism and Papacy—born of corruption and fraud, and handed down to curse future generations, through the medium of a pious credulity—contemptible practice so common with a certain class of our opponents—this exhibition of himself—in one part or another unmistakably crops out—positions, all of them, too absurd for sane and sensible men to give them a moment's adherence—the inherent falsity and unsoundness of such positions should with an unsparing hand be laid open to public view," etc., etc.

What will "J. W." say to this? Will he still say that "Br. Smith's reply" is "marked with his usual lucid and happy style?" Will it make their readers

generally feel "happy?" Will such a "happy style" be likely to add any particular beauty to their "splendid book?" And must we say that this is "Br. Smith's *usual* happy style?"

But says the reader, "It appears that Eld. Smith is not acquainted with Eld. Preble; and therefore has no charity for him as a man of ability, fairness, and candor." No doubt many of his readers would so judge. But the following extract from *Both Sides* (p. 220) will assist the reader in regard to judging in this matter. He says: "For no man of his age and ability, of his fairness and candor in every other respect, of his experience in the things of God, and especially in connection with the great truth of the second coming of the Savior—no such man, we say, with truth on his side, would advance the incongruous positions, and the lame and halting arguments which he has presented. But error disarms the strongest." Also on p. 222 he says: "With no less sincere feelings of regard for your position, age, and experience, have we reviewed your arguments than we felt when, at the home of the writer, in West Wilton, N. H., twenty years ago, you made known in clearness and power the doctrine of the Lord's soon coming; or when you laid your hand upon his head, and said, 'Bub, do you love the Lord Jesus?' We can now answer that question. We do love him. We take him for our Savior."

MISREPRESENTATIONS, OR PERVERSIONS.

My reviewer, in his "reply," has misrepresented not only myself, but Webster, Greenfield, J. Litch, S. Bliss, the Greek language, and the Holy Scriptures; in all about *two hundred times!* He also *contradicts himself*, in many plain instances! But book-making is a little too expensive, and time too precious, to notice them in full; and, in fact, the cause of truth does not require it: as the reader will be likely to notice all he will desire to. Only a few, therefore, of the more important cases will be noticed.

MISREPRESENTATIONS RELATING TO MYSELF.

Before entering upon an examination of these misrepresentations, I wish to say that I am disposed to be charitable, and attribute them, not to the corruption of the heart, nor the weakness of the head of their author—for he claims honesty for himself; and does not appear to be deficient in intellect. But let us remember, that he has complained that my lengthy quotations of Scripture have had a tendency to worry him, or the reader, "*into complete bewilderment!*"

The following instances will give the reader some idea of the manner in which I have been misrepresented. On p. 12 of *Both Sides* the author says:

"This is plain; that is, there is no mistaking the position of the writer. It is that the observance of one day above another

is a matter of complete indifference. It is no matter if we do, and it is no matter if we don't. This comports well with his previous argument, that there is no holy time in this dispensation."

"*This is plain,*" is it not? But plain what? Plain truth? or plain perversion? Let us see. What is my language to which he refers? I first quoted Romans 14: 5, 6, thus:

"'One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord: and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it.'"

Then I added these remarks:

"If any one believe otherwise, let him be 'fully persuaded in his own mind;' and I, for myself, intend to be fully persuaded, or *assured*, as the margin reads, in my own mind; so, if any one thinks he ought to observe the seventh day for the Sabbath, I do not wish to have contention with him about it; for if he can regard the day 'unto the Lord,' let him do so; but as for myself, I do not now so regard it. I carried that 'yoke' as long as I thought I could regard the day 'unto the Lord.' If others wish to esteem the seventh day above another, let *them* try it until *they* are satfied, as I have been. I now regard the 'first day' 'unto the Lord.'"

With this before him, how could he say, "This is plain," "that the observance of one day above another is a matter of complete indifference!" And in the closing remark in the above paragraph, he says, "This comports well with his previous argument, that there is no holy time in this dispensation." But what did

I say? My words, which were before him at the time, were precisely these: "If there is any one day mentioned in the Scriptures which is *now* more 'holy' than another, *made so by the express or direct command* of Almighty God, then the 'seventh day' is the one." It will be seen by those who read my argument, that I do not pretend that the "first day of the week" has ever been made "holy" by "the *express* or *direct* command of Almighty God;" but the importance of this day, as "THE LORD'S DAY," is proved by other arguments. On p. 39 the writer says:

"There are three gross absurdities which attach themselves to this position of our opponents, that death under the old dispensation was the full penalty of the law of God. (1) It makes God commit into the hands of man the full penalty of the law, or the punishment of offences committed against himself! (2) When a person was stoned, he paid the penalty of the law, and in the resurrection he will be raised, of course, to salvation, for the law has no more claims upon him, he having paid the penalty. (3) If a person, under that dispensation, should elude the vigilance of the law, and though he had committed crime, was not detected, in the resurrection he also will be raised to salvation; for no law will be found to demand his punishment. And thus the sinner might offend against God, and yet, if he should escape the short-sighted and uncertain vigilance of man, go free! Was God ever thus slack and loose in his system of government? Let those alone believe it, whose position compels them to that absurdity."

These "gross absurdities," I think, surely do not attach to me, or any one else I ever heard of. On p. 52 he says:

"If we understand Eld. P., he finds fault with the law, and considers it an evidence that it is 'done away,' because it will not justify the guilty! A law that would justify its own violation."

All I need say to this is, "perhaps" the writer of such language will "understand Eld. P." better some day. On p. 59 he says:

"By his quotation of this Scripture, he accuses us, because we keep the Sabbath, of treading under foot the Son of God, counting the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and doing despite to the Spirit of grace! Thus does he make the keeping of the seventh day the most heinous crime that can be committed against the Son of God! We pause in utter amazement at such an application of Scripture."

Did *I* so apply this Scripture? or did my *accuser* so apply it? Let us see. In order that there shall be no mistake in this case, I will here quote what I said in connection with the accusation to which reference is made:

"'What shall we say then? that the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith; but Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? *Because they sought it not by faith*, but as it were by the works of the law: for they stumbled at that stumbling stone.' (Rom. 9: 30–32.) Yes, 'they stumbled at that stumbling-stone!' Would to God the *stumbling* had all been confined to the old Jews! But, alas! too many are *still stumbling in the same way*, and for the same cause! They love the old law of works better than the *new law of faith!* And it appears to me that the language of the apostle to the Hebrews will most strikingly apply to such: 'He that despised

Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath *trodden under foot the Son of God*, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and *hath done despite* unto the *Spirit of grace?* (Heb. 10: 28, 29.) But, alas! alas! how many are still trying to be justified by the 'law of works,' instead of the 'law of faith,' through our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a fearful thing for men to trample 'under foot the Son of God!' as *they* verily do, who turn aside from his 'law of faith,' the law of the 'Spirit,' the law of 'GRACE!' to follow the *old law of works!*".

How could the writer say, "He accuses us because we keep the Sabbath!" when "Seventh-day Adventist," nor the word "Sabbath," is not mentioned by me in this connection. What need of "such manifest sensitiveness here?" If he thinks it applies to *them*, he is welcome to so apply it; but he must not say that my language so applies it. Commencing on p. 60, he continues:

"But we pass the dividing line between that dispensation and this, and lo, according to Eld. P., the same acts which before insured the blessing of God, now call down his bitterest curse; an observance which before he esteemed to his honor, he now regards as the highest crime that can be committed against his Son! Cursed there for violating the Sabbath, and blessed here for the same acts! blessed there for keeping it, and cursed here for the same acts!"

He then closes by saying, "Eld. Preble, is such the character of the God with whom we have to do?" Comment by me, upon this, is unnecessary. On p. 74 he declares:

"There is only one point mentioned in all the New Testament where anything is said to have ceased, to have been done away or abolished; and that is at the cross of Christ. Seemingly aware that this fact is essential to his purpose, Eld. P. then endeavors to throw an air of indefiniteness over the whole, as though John and Christ were about the same, and the testimony concerning either equally applicable to the case in hand. This method of reasoning will not do. If the law ceased *at* John, it did not cease *at* Christ; and if it ceased *at* Christ it did not cease *at* John. But Eld. P. has declared positively that *in the time* of John, the law 'there deceased;' and yet he quotes the testimony of Paul, as applicable to the same event, that *Christ* is the *end* of the law. If the law ceased *at* John's ministry, John was the end of it, not Christ, using the word end as Eld. P. understands it; but if Christ is the end of the law, the end of its existence, as Eld. P. holds, then it ceased with him, not with John. Both positions cannot be true. Our opponents are called upon to state definitely which they will take. Such india-rubber modes of argument will not answer."

The *italics* are mine. In reply, I will just introduce here what a venerable gentleman in Kentucky said about *"visionary hair-splitters:"*

"I remember, many years since, a wealthy man died. His son, his executor, wrote to his brother, an eminent jurist, to look at the will, and write to him as to its import in certain particulars. The jurist wrote back to him: 'Read the will to your wife, and to brother Richard's wife, and they will tell you what it all imports. Wills are to be interpreted according to the most simple, common acceptation of the language in which they are written. Common minds, with common sense, will ascertain their true meaning, when hair-splitters will doubt.'"

Only about *six lines* below where his "india-rubber modes of argument" are referred to, he says, in speaking of Romans 10: 4:

"Our opponents almost uniformly quote as much as this, 'Christ is the end of the law,' and there stop, intending to convey the impression that Christ put an end to the existence of the law. But the reader will notice that Paul is careful to add, *'for righteousness:'* 'Christ is the end of the law for righteousness;' and he does not stop there, but continues, *'to every one that believeth.'*"

Is not this designed to impress the reader with the idea that I garbled the Scriptures, only quoting so much as, "Christ is the end of the law?" But if the reader will just turn to p. 72 of *Both Sides* he will see that I not only quoted all that my accuser quotes, but *every word*, beginning with Romans 10: 4, and ending with v. 9. What was the occasion of this charge? On p. 86 he says:

"It is not a little surprising that Eld. P., while so strenuously professing to be a follower of the teachings of the 'living Jesus,' should so soon join issue with his teachings, endeavor to explain away his words, and avoid obedience to his plain and explicit requirements. * * * Eld. P. endeavors to explain away his language when applied to the washing of feet, and rejects that ordinance."

Oh! no! "Eld. P. "does not "endeavor to explain away" the teachings of the "living Jesus," as any one can see by turning to what I did say on this point as found on pp. 82, 83 of *Both Sides*. My teachings were these:

"In this connection we have an *'example'* given us by our Savior of the practical bearing of this new 'commandment.' It is found in the first part of John 13, in Christ washing the disciples' feet. And as some contend that Jesus *commanded*

his people to attend to the washing of feet, in connection with the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, as a part of the ordinance itself, I am led here to say, this is a mistake! It is not so! There is no *command* or precept about it. The Greek word for *command*, or precept, as used by the Savior in this connection, is *entolee;* meaning 'precept, command, law,' etc. But the original word, used by Christ in John 13: 15, when he says, 'I have given you an *example,*' is *hupodigma:* meaning an 'example *proposed for imitation or admonition,*' etc. (Greenfield.) And in this case we shall find that the example of Christ was for '*admonition,*' for the disciples deserved it. The case was this: The disciples had first been engaged in a '*strife*' among themselves, to see 'which of them should be accounted the *greatest*' (Luke 22: 24): and the spirit of selfishness and rivalry was in direct violation of the true import of the '*new commandment.*' Hence, 'their Lord and Master' just set them an '*example*' of humility and '*love*' toward each other; they must be *servants* to each other, and never strive to see 'which of them should be accounted the *greatest.*' Thus we see that '*love* one to another' is the 'fulfilling' of Christ's *new law or commandment;* as we find in Romans 13: 8–10. 'Owe no man anything, but to love one another, for he that *loveth* another hath *fulfilled* the *law.* For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and *if there be any other commandment,* it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*' Love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore, *love* is the *fulfilling of the law.* It appears that *this* 'example' of Christ was enough for the disciples while they lived, for we never find them, after this, washing each other's feet in connection with the Lord's Supper. They doubtless remembered this '*example*' of their 'Lord and Master' to 'love one another,' as Christ had loved them; and so there was no more strife among them, to see 'which of them should be accounted the greatest.' And so

I would recommend to all who feel like 'strife,' to see who shall 'be accounted the greatest,' just to wash one another's feet until they have love one to another.' But we need not wash each other's feet, as a part of the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, because Christ commanded us to do it; for he never did any such thing. But under similar circumstances, we had better follow the '*example*' of 'our Lord and Master;' and, then, as he says, 'if ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them; yes, 'happy' are we, if we only keep the *new* commandment to '*love* one another,' for there is no unhappiness or fear in '*love*.' We shall be 'happy' if we only follow Christ's 'example;' for 'perfect love casteth out fear.'"

But my accuser inquires: "Does he [Christ] mean that we should do it; [*i. e.*, wash feet] or does he not?" Yes, certainly he did mean that "*we*" should do it—it is very appropriate, I think. This is just what I tried to enforce upon the minds of a certain class—as will be seen above—*they* should do it. On p. 91 is found the following:

"And then, on his own ground, as already shown, the law of Christ is abrogated, and we are left without any law either old or new, according to Galatians 6: 2; and he cannot deny it."

To this, I only need say, I am not disposed to "deny it," because no one of "common sense" will believe it on a little reflection. Again on p. 99 he says:

"But Eld. P. says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day; and what testimony does he offer? Not a syllable; from the fact that there is not a syllable that he can offer."

It is rather hard for me to think this accusation was the result of "bewilderment;" as there is a little too much ingenuity displayed about it. It will be

seen by examination, as found on p. 97 of *Both Sides*, that I had made the following remark about the "Christian Sabbath," without, as yet, offering any proof:

"'THE LORD'S DAY,' THE TRUE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.—About sixty-two years after the resurrection of Christ—or after the Christian Sabbath began—the 'beloved' John, who was our 'brother and companion in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ,' 'while he was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ,' said—'*I was in the Spirit on* THE LORD'S DAY,' etc. Here shines the clear blazing light of the Christian Sabbath, according to the Gospel of THE LIVING JESUS: notwithstanding so many are trying, with a '*veil upon their hearts*,' to throw a dark cloud over the whole thing, by saying that the 'Lord's day here spoken of 'is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment,' as found in Exodus 20: 8–11. But how many, through ignorance, 'pervert the Gospel of Christ.'"

My proof for this position immediately followed; but the author of the above assertion thought best to *divide* what I had said from the proof which immediately followed; and then triumphantly asks:

"*What* TESTIMONY *does he offer? Not a* SYLLABLE, from the fact that there is not *a syllable* that he can offer."

Then, after more than half a page of his "reply," closing with these words: "We need say no more, to cause such assertions to recoil with terrible severity upon the head of their author," he brings in my testimony, which reads thus:

"The word here rendered '*Lord's*' is in the Greek, *kuriakos*, and it is found elsewhere in the New Testament but *once*, and

this is in 1 Corinthians 11: 20, where it refers to the 'Lord's [*kuriakos*] Supper.' The question now arises, Whose 'supper' is here referred to? Is it the Lord JEHOVAH'S Supper? or is it the Lord JESUS CHRIST'S Supper? All must confess that it is the Lord Jesus Christ's Supper. Then is the Lord's [*kuriakos*] DAY' (Rev. 1: 10) the Lord JESUS CHRIST'S day. Thus we have the plain word of God to establish this long-disputed truth. Praise God. *Amen.* Here, then, we have the proof that 'the passover' had, as its substitute, the 'Lord's [*kuriakos*] Supper;' and as a substitute for 'the Sabbath,' the 'Lord's [*kuriakos*] day,' as I have above stated: the *passover* is to have its complete fulfillment in 'the kingdom of God' (Luke 22: 16), and just so of the Sabbath.' (Heb. 4: 3; Rev. 20: 4.)"

To this subdivision of my argument which he saw fit to make, he commences his reply in the following language:

"We are sorry to spoil Eld. P.'s joy at his imaginary discovery; but we fail to see any long-disputed truth established by his testimony."

This proves that he knew something about the "testimony" which I had presented in favor of the "first day" being the "Lord's day:" and yet he was pleased to declare that it was a *fact* that "there is *not a syllable that he can offer!*" Does the "*seventh-day* Sabbath" depend on such efforts as these for its support? I have no doubt it was a painful duty for the apostle Paul, when he met Peter at Antioch, to "withstand him to the face, because he was to be blamed!" But painful duties must be performed sometimes; and my most fervent prayer has been,

and still is, that I may not err in word, or in spirit, in performing this my present unpleasant duty; for I, and the reader, must soon "stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." On pp. 109 and 189 we find the following:

"Hence, according to this view, this 'new code of laws,' this 'new law of faith,' will permit us to have other gods before Jehovah, bow down and worship graven images, violate the Sabbath, dishonor our parents, steal, bear false witness, and covet. * * * But according to Eld. P., all has become new. And as the new Sabbath is kept on another day from the original, and for a different reason, being thus an entirely different institution, perhaps the other new regulations will permit us to worship graven images, swear, kill, lie, and steal at least a little. Who knows?"

Such language needs no comment from me.

The next point I wish to notice in *Both Sides*, is the following, from p.75:

"Christ being the end of the law, then, has to do only with believers; and if end there means end of existence, the law is only abolished for Christians, and is still binding on the great mass of the world, who are yet in unbelief and sin. This is a sufficient condemnation of Eld. P.'s theory, which is that the law has never been binding on the Gentiles, be they saints or sinners. * * * If Eld. P. has ever consulted Webster on the word end, he has found a definition like this: 'The ultimate point or thing at which one aims or directs his views; the object intended to be reached or accomplished by any action or scheme; purpose intended; scope; aim; drift.' And if he has ever looked for its definition in Greek, he has found Greenfield giving one meaning as follows: 'End, scope, object, principal point, the sum of anything;' and then referring to this

very passage, Romans 10: 4, as an example of its use in this sense. And if he has ever consulted such passages as Romans 14: 9; 2 Corinthians 2: 9; 1 Timothy 1: 5; Hebrews 13: 7; James 5: 11, &c., he has seen some instances of a like use of the word in the Bible. As for instance, 'Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the *end* of the Lord; surely not the end of his existence."

Now let us analyze this quotation in its most important bearings, and see how much truth it contains. It is said:

"If Eld. P. has ever consulted Webster on this word *end*, he has found a definition like this: 'The ultimate point or thing at which one aims, or directs his views; the object intended to be reached or accomplished by any action or scheme; purpose intended; scope; aim; drift."

Mark this: He says "*a* definition." Yes; but which of the *seventeen* given by Webster? The *fifteenth!* It is "*a* definition," surely! But why were not the last words even under *this* head quoted: so that his readers could have known for themselves how Webster intended we should understand him? For Webster closed by saying, "as private *ends;* public *ends.*" Will this then apply to the passage in Romans 10: 4, and thus make it that Christ is the *private* end, or *public* end of the law? This will not do, will it? But what does Webster give for the definition of this word "end," as found under "1, 2, 3, 4;" as its meaning?

"1. The extreme point of a line, or of anything that has more length than breadth, etc.

"2. The extremity or last part, in general; the close or conclusion, applied to time.

"3. The conclusion or cessation of any action.

"4. The close or conclusion; as the end of a chapter."

Now, by taking the first clause of each of these four definitions, and annexing the phrase "of the law" to them, we have the following:

1. The extreme point—*of the law.*
2. The extremity or last part—*of the law.*
3. The conclusion or cessation—*of the law.*
4. The close or conclusion—*of the law.*

This will probably be sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind that "Eld. P. has consulted Webster on the word end." Next comes Greenfield.

"And if he [Preble] has ever looked for its definition in the Greek, he has found Greenfield giving one meaning as follows: 'End, scope, object, principal point, the sum of anything;' and then referring to this very passage, Romans 10: 4, as an example of its use in this sense."

Let the reader mark this also—"*one* meaning"—yes, "*one!*" But what *one?* the primary or literal sense of the word? We will examine: The word "end" as found in this passage in Romans 10: 4 is from the Greek *telos.* What does Greenfield give as its definition? I will notice the most of it:

"An end, termination, end *of life*, decease, death; *meton. put for* one who puts an end to, or abolishes *anything.* Romans 10: 4, *where others,* one who accomplishes or completes *anything; for* the last; an end, result, issue, event; an accom-

plishment; *met.* the end, scope, object, principal point, the sum of *anything*, Romans 10: 4; 1 Timothy 1: 5, &c."

Thus it will be seen that, instead of taking the primary or literal meaning of the word "end" [Gr. *telos*], my accuser passes to the *seventh*, and *metaphorical*, use of the word, to sustain him in his bold assertions! And so it appears that, if we use the terms as Greenfield uses them, in their primary or literal sense, and annex the words "the law" to them, we shall find the result thus: "termination"—of "the law;" "abolishes"—"the law,"&c. This must suffice to show that "Eld. P." has looked for the "definition" of the word "end" [*telos*] "in Greek." But to complete the analysis of the above peculiar extract from *Both Sides*, I will just notice what is said in the closing part of it. It reads:

"And if he [Preble] has ever consulted such passages as Romans 14: 9; 2 Corinthians 2: 9; 1 Timothy 1: 5; Hebrews 13: 7; James 5: 11, &c., he has seen some instances of a like use of the word in the Bible. As for instance, 'Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the *end* of the Lord:' surely not the end of his existence."

Well, "Eld. P." has "consulted" such passages as named above, and finds that the word *telos*, or end, is not to be found in *three* of the passages referred to; the word only occurring in 1 Timothy 1: 5 and James 5: 11; the first is used in a *metaphorical* sense, according to Greenfield, as above shown. And if the construction put upon the passage in James affords its author any particular comfort, we have no

desire to participate with him in it! What would be said of "*first-day*" advocates if *they* were compelled to resort to such a mode of reasoning as the foregoing develops?

MISREPRESENTATIONS OF J. LITCH AND S. BLISS.

On pp. 116–18 of *Both Sides* we find some things which require notice. On p. 116 is the following:

"But as we see Eld. P. so entangled in the Greek, we cannot help inquiring where he has been the past fifteen years, during which time the Sabbath question has been especially agitated, and the point here brought up been under frequent discussion. Could none of his brethren help him here? We might refer him to J. Litch, present editor of the *Advent Herald*, whose experience has been such as to at least qualify him to give to those who think of arraying the Greek on the Sunday side of this question just the information they need; also to what the late S. Bliss, formerly editor of the *Herald*, has written upon it; and to an article from Prof. N. N. Whiting, of Williamsburg, N. Y., published in the *Voice of the Prophets*, as late as September, 1863."

By analyzing the above, we find that "Eld. P." is not the only one who gets "entangled;" for what is said about "J. Litch" is not only contradictory, but somewhat amusing withal: for the writer says of him that his "experience has been such as to at least qualify him to give to those who think of arraying the Greek on the Sunday side of this question just the information they need." Then on p. 117 he says:

"Almost thirteen years ago, J. Litch wrote a short article on

the Sabbath, using the Greek exactly as Eld. P. has used it in the article before us."

This admits that J. Litch used "the Greek exactly as Eld. P. used it." Hence, it follows that J. Litch got "entangled in the Greek," notwithstanding his "experience has been such as to at least qualify him to give to those who think of arraying the Greek on the Sunday side of this question just the information they need." And because J. Litch did use "the Greek" "exactly as Eld. P. has used it," with all his "experience" and "qualifications" for giving us just the "information" that we "need" in regard to this criticism now under consideration, he has to be condemned now, and S. Bliss is brought forward for the purpose of setting him right. The author of these contradictions introduces S. Bliss to his readers, as follows:

"As we have referred to the testimony of the late S. Bliss, we will give a paragraph from his pen on this point. In the *Advent Herald* of July 16, 1851, almost thirteen years ago, J. Litch wrote a short article on the Sabbath, using the Greek exactly as Eld. P. has used it in the article before us. S. Bliss, then editor of the *Herald*, and also a zealous First-day Adventist, appended a few remarks to Litch's article, completely exposing the fallacy of his criticism upon the Greek."

Mark this: "*Completely exposing the fallacy of his criticism upon the Greek.*" This will assist us in determining how the writer misrepresents S. Bliss. For the author of these contradictions continues by saying:

"Considering his [Bliss'] views and position, this must be taken as a fair and honest comment upon the meaning of the Greek as touching the first day of the week, and should be authority with all First-day Adventists."

Note this: *"And should be authority with all First-day Adventists."* But the writer still continues, and says:

"After Eld. Litch had offered his criticism, stating that the phrase, first day of the week, should be rendered 'one of Sabbaths,' &c., exactly as Eld. P. affirms, Bliss appended to his article the following paragraph:

"'REMARKS.—Lest any should gather from the above that the word Sabbath is represented by the phrase, "first day of the week," we add that Sabbath is simply translated *week* in those texts—other words indicating the day of the week. The word Sabbath is originally a Hebrew word, and signifies rest; but occurring at regular intervals, by a metonymy it became significant of the period separated by these rests. So that we have the seventh day of the rest, and the first day of the rest, week, or Sabbath.'"

Now do these remarks of S. Bliss expose a fallacy in J. Litch's criticism upon the Greek? We will see. This will be best determined by here introducing the original article from J. Litch, with the remarks of S. Bliss, which are as follows:

"THE SABBATH QUESTION.

"'Br. Himes: I was forcibly struck while reading several tracts with which I met while on my passage from New York to Hartford, with the apparent disingenuousness of the writer. One argument on which he seemed to lay great stress in support of the seventh-day Sabbath was this: that Sabbath means rest, that the seventh day is called a Sabbath in the New Testament, the first day is not so called, but is always designated *the first day of the week.*

"'The truth is—and Sabbatarians either do or ought to know it—the Evangelists never in the language in which the Gospels are found (the Greek) called the first day of the week anything else but Sabbath. For the information of those who are shaken in their minds on this subject, I will transcribe the Greek text in *italics*, containing the words rendered by our translators first day of the week, and also the word rendered by them *Sabbath*, meaning the seventh day.

"'Matthew 28: 1—*English translation:* "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week." *Greek—Opse de Sabbatoon, te epiphooskuse eis mian Sabbatoon.* There the identical word in the same case, genitive plural rendered Sabbath when referring to the seventh day, is rendered first day of the week in the very next clause of the verse. A literal rendering would be, if we adopt the principle of our translators of Anglicising instead of translating the word—"And in the end of Sabbaths, as it began to dawn toward one of Sabbath." Does not this indicate that one series of Sabbaths there ended, so far as obligation to observe it was concerned, and a new series was introduced? At any rate, the first is as positively called Sabbath as the seventh day. And all four of the Evangelists designate it by the same word. Mark 16: 2—*Kailian prooi tes mias Sabbatoon*—"And very early the one of Sabbaths." &c. Luke 24: 1—*Te de mia toon Sabbatoon*—"And the one of the Sabbaths," &c. John 20: 1—*Te de mia toon Sabbatoon*—"And in the one of the Sabbaths," &c. Thus the four Evangelists do agree in calling the first by the same name they do the seventh day of the week, and that word as certainly signifies rest in the one case as in the other. Let no one, therefore, hereafter contend that the writers of the New Testament never call the first day Sabbath, or rest, for no New Testament writer has called it anything else, except John (Rev. 1: 10), where it is called the "Lord's day." J. LITCH.

"'Philadelphia, July 16, 1851.'

"REMARKS.—Lest any should gather from the above, that the word Sabbath is represented by the phrase 'first day of the week,' we add that Sabbath is simply translated *week* in those texts—other words indicating the day of the week. The word Sabbath is originally a Hebrew word, and signifies rest; but occuring at regular intervals, by a metonymy it became significant of the periods separated by these rests. So that we have

the seventh day of the rest, and the first of the rest, week, or Sabbath.—ED.'[1]

Thus, it is seen, that the object of these remarks was simply to *add* a little to what J. Litch had written, lest any should gather the idea that the word Sabbath is represented by the phrase, "first day of the week;" that is, he wished it understood that "*sabbatoon*" does not represent the whole phrase, "first day of the week"—but simply *week;* "other words indicating the day of the week." But let the reader mark well the closing remark of S. Bliss in his note: "So that we have the seventh day of the rest, *and the first of the rest, week, or Sabbath.*" Thank the Lord that our late and much-lamented Br. Bliss ever penned these words for us. They are just to the point—just what I believe, and have argued as well as I could. And as the writer of *Both Sides* says in regard to this, as above quoted, "Considering his [Bliss'] views and position, this must be taken as a fair and honest comment upon the meaning of the Greek as touching the first day of the week, and should be authority with all First-day Adventists." So I say: and it ought to be so with "*Seventh-day* Adventists," also, because it is true.

Now we will present an extract from *Both Sides,* showing what the author said in regard to this word "*sabbaton,*" immediately following S. Bliss' "remarks:"

"From the foregoing it is evident that the word *sabbaton*

sometimes means the whole week. How, then, shall we determine *when* it has this meaning? Easily enough. Robinson says that it has this meaning 'after numerals denoting the days of the week.' We now inquire, Does the word *sabbatoń*, in those places where the expression, 'first day of the week,' occurs in the New Testament, follow a numerical adjective denoting the day of the week? We answer, Yes, *in every instance.* Then no one can deny, without discarding all authority, that in these instances *sabbaton* means week, and the translation of our common version is correct. One instance will suffice for the whole, and we will take the first one—Matthew 28: 1. The words are *mian sabbaton* (pronounced with long o, as in tone). *Mian* is the numeral adjective meaning one, or according to a Hebrewism, 'first.' It agrees with day understood. *Sabbaton* is in the genitive plural, literally answering to the English words, 'of the week.' So we have as plain as language can say it, 'first day of the week.'

"Eld. P. argues, however, that here the Lord Jehovah's Sabbaths ceased, and the Lord Jesus Christ's Sabbaths were introduced, or one series of Sabbaths there ended, and another series of Sabbaths there began. But this little shift in favor of Sunday, involves a fatal violation of grammar which he has apparently overlooked. If his rendering is correct, and first day of the week should be rendered 'one of Sabbaths,' meaning one of a new series of Sabbaths then introduced, then the word one, *mian*, must agree with *sabbaton* understood. But *sabbaton* is *neuter*, and *mian* is *feminine.* Grammar will not submit to any such treatment as this. The word *mian* being in the feminine gender shows that the noun understood, with which it agrees, is a feminine noun. And there is no word which can be introduced to supply the ellipsis except the word which the translators of our Bible have supplied, namely: *heemeran*, day, which renders the sense complete, and being a feminine noun, answers to the feminine adjective, *mian*, and makes the con-

struction harmonious and perfect. We accordingly find in the margin of the Greek Testament, a reference from the word *mian*, saying '*heemeran* understood.' And we are forced to the conclusion that Greenfield, Robinson, and Liddell and Scott, in their Lexicons, and the forty-seven learned men of England who made our version of the New Testament, are correct in their translation, and Eld. P. is wrong."

Wherein is Eld. P. "wrong?" The criticism on the Greek word "*heemeran*—day" I endorse. But the reader will not fail to notice that in my argument, the word *sabbaton*, rendered *week*, was the particular point of my remarks. On the word "day"—*heemeran*, I simply remarked in brackets "[*day* is a word supplied by the translators]." I did not express one word in regard to whether the translators were right or wrong in this. But my reviewer saw fit to change the issue in part, so as to call attention particularly to the Greek word *heemeran*, as well as to *sabbaton*. We thank him for "this little shift in favor of Sunday." He has done us good service. But how much does it help the "seventh day" side, in this controversy? Not any; but is directly *against it*. We admit that the word "*sabbaton*," when preceded by a numeral adjective, denoting the day of the week, should—*if translated at all*—be rendered *week*. But what do Seventh-day Adventists gain by this? Let it be remembered that *Both Sides* has abundantly proved that the word "day" should be supplied as the translators have it, in the phrase "first day of the week." Now let us consider.

How many days are there in a week? *Seven.* What is the "*first* day" called? Sunday. What is the "*seventh* day" called? Saturday. So we see that *the disciples*—mark it—DID NOT meet on the *seventh day of the week,* but on the "FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK." Thank *Both Sides* again, for proving this so clearly. So we see that the "clear blazing light still shines."

PROF. N. N. WHITING.

The following is the article from Prof. N. N. Whiting, referred to on p. 116 of *Both Sides:*

"The Hebrew word 'Sabbath' has been *transferred* by the translators of the Septuagint and by the New Testament writers. You are aware that it signifies '*a rest,*' '*a lying by from labor.*' In the Greek it appears in two forms, one is *Sabbaton,* a neuter noun of the second declension, with a plural, *Sabbata.* The dative plural of this word is *Sabbasi,* found in the third declension, *as if from a nominative, Sabbat,* or *Sabbas.* The genitive plural is *Sabbaton,* (long o, as in our word *tone.*) An English reader when he sees the nominative *Sabbaton* (short o, as in *not*), would be likely to confound it with the genitive plural, or *vice versa.* So much for the form of the word. Now for the use.

"1. *Sabbaton* signifies '*a rest,*' '*a Sabbath*'—especially, *the seventh day of the week.* By a metonymy it is also used as *the interval from Sabbath to Sabbath*; that is, '*a week.*' So in Luke 18: 12, *dis tou Sabbaton,* 'twice in a week.' In other *instances,* this word is used after numerals, as 'first,' and in Matthew 28: 1, after *mian,* 'one' by Hebrewism for 'first.' So Mark 16: 9, "Early the first day of the week, "*Proi prote Sabbaton.* So Luke 24: 1; John 20: 1.

"2. The *plural* form, *Sabbata*, is used often with the *singular signification*. This may be regarded as a Hebrew idiom. In these cases it is in the genitive or dative case, plural, as *Sabbaton* or *Sabbasi*. For examples of genitive plural, see Matthew 28: 1; Luke 4: 16; Matthew 12: 1; Acts 13: 15; 16: 13. For dative plural, Mark 2 : 24; Luke 4: 31; 6: 2; 13: 10. I believe that there are only two instances in which *Sabbata* (in nominative plural) is properly translated Sabbaths, viz.: Acts 17: 2 and Colossians 2: 16. In the Septuagint, *Sabbata* (nominative plural) is used as a *singular*—Exodus 16: 23, 26. Now, as to the passages to which you refer, viz.:

"Mark 16: 9—*prote tou Sabbaton*, is 'the first *day* of the week.'

"Mark 16: 1—*diagenomenou tou Sabbaton*, is 'the Sabbath being passed.'

"Mark 16: 2—*tes mias Sabbaton* (plural), 'of the first day of the week.'

"Luke 24: 1—see above.

"John 20: 1—*te mia tou Sabbaton*, is 'the first day of the week.'

"John 20: 19—*tou Sabbaton*, 'of the week.'

"1 Corinthians 16: 2—*kata mian Sabbaton*, is 'on the first *day* of the week;' and Acts 20: 7 is exactly the same; *i. e.*, *mia Sabbaton*.

"Now, then, I regard Colossians 2: 16 as decisive on the Sabbath question. 'We are to let no man judge [*i. e.*, *have authority*] over us in respect to the distinctions of meats or drinks, as clean or unclean, and in respect to holydays, or new-moons, or Sabbaths.' It is in vain to say that other days beside Saturday were 'days of rest,' or Sabbaths. The plural (genitive) *Sabbaton*, will include *all days of rest*. Its most general reference, as we all know, is to the most frequent (Sabbath) day of rest. Let me recommend to your notice *Paley's*

Moral Philosophy, article 'Sabbath,' for a clear and concise view of this subject."

But how much does this help the "seventh-day" side of the question? None at all. Yet it was referred to in the "reply," in order to prove that "Eld. P." was the one "*so entangled in the Greek.*" But we will let the author of *Both Sides*, who is also now editor of the *Review*, speak for himself, as he does in his paper dated August 2, 1864; and then we shall know how he considered it in *fact*. He says:

"In No. 6 of last volume, the reader will remember that we published an article on the Sabbath question from the *Voice of the Prophets*, written by Prof. N. N. Whiting, in which the whole question of the Sabbath was made to rest, *without argument*, and almost without comment, on Colossians 2: 16. The *falsity of the assertion*, that Colossians 2: 16 is decisive on the Sabbath question, we fully showed in the same paper, proving, if we may be allowed to judge, that that language of Paul does not refer to the weekly Sabbath at all."

So it appears from this leading editorial, that the aged Prof. N. N. Whiting, well known as one of the most profound Hebrew and Greek scholars we have among us, must come in for his share, also, of misrepresentation and denunciation! How could a young man, with a Christian heart, and a sound, clear head, pen such words as these: "*The falsity of the assertion,*" etc., aimed, as these words are, at a Christian man like Prof. Whiting! What would not the boldness of such a man lead him to say! And again we ask, Do Seventh-day Adventists

find it necessary to resort to such a course as *this*, in order to maintain *their* cause! What shall we say of such a cause? We leave the reader to decide. Few, I think, will be likely to call it a very *"happy style!"* It must be that this *young* man has really been "worried into a state of complete bewilderment," until *he* is the one that has become "so entangled in the Greek!"

And to prove this more fully, we will introduce a few examples of

MISREPRESENTATIONS OF THE TRUE IMPORT OF THE GREEK.

On. p. 25 of *Both Sides* we find the following:

"'Of what,' asks Eld. P., 'is the Sabbath a sign or type?' Mark the expression, 'a sign *or type!*' Here he is guilty of Fallacy No. 4, by connecting the word type with the word sign, thereby covertly insinuating that they mean one and the same thing. We have already alluded to the distinction between a sign and a type. The word used for sign, where the Sabbath is called a sign, is *seemion*, which is defined thus: 'A sign; *i. e.*, a mark, token by which anything is known or distinguished; a token, pledge, assurance; a proof, evidence, convincing token,' &c. The word for type, is a very different word, namely: *tupos*, which is defined, 'a mark, impression, print of a stroke or blow; a form, image, effigy; *i. e.*, a statue; pattern, model; a type, figure, emblem, that which exhibits a representation or likeness of anything,'" etc.

Much fault has been found with me, because I say "sign *or type!*" I am pronounced "guilty" for con-

necting the word *type* with the word *sign*. And as my accuser says, "thereby covertly insinuating that they mean one and the same thing." Now let us examine the words *seemion*, or sign, and *tupos*, or type. First, let us examine Greenfield for his definition of these words; and then we will look at Webster. Greenfield gives it thus:

"*Seemion*, a sign; *i. e.*, a mark, token *by which anything is known or distinguished;* a token, pledge, assurance; a proof, evidence, convincing token; a sign, wonder; *i. e.*, a remarkable event, wonderful appearance, extraordinary phenomenon; a portent prodigy; a wonderful work, miraculous operation, miracle: *meton.* a sign; *i. e.*, a distinguished person."

"*Tupos*, a mark, impression, print *of a stroke or blow;* a form, image, effigy; *i. e.*, a statue; pattern, model: *meton.* a type, figure, emblem, that which exhibits a representation or likeness of *anything* (Rom. 5: 14); a pattern, example; *i. e.*, something worthy of, or proposed for, imitation; admonition, warning; something exhibited by way of admonition; example, form, contents, argument *of an epistle;* a rule, form, system, *of doctrine.*"

So much for Greenfield. Now for Webster:

"*Sign.* 1. A token; something by which another thing is shown or represented, etc. 3. A wonder; a miracle; etc. 4. Some visible transaction, event, or appearance, intended as proof or evidence, of something else; etc. 7. Visible mark or representation, etc. 9. Typical representation."

"*Type.* 1. The mark of something, an emblem; that which represents something else. 2. Sign; a symbol; a figure of something to come, etc. 6. A stamp or mark."

Now let us condense these definitions by comparing one with the other. 1. What is the first or pri-

mary meaning of the words "sign" and "type," according to Greenfield? In each case it is "a mark." How according to Webster? "Sign: a token, something by which another thing is shown or represented." "Type: 1. The mark of something," etc. 2. "A sign," etc.

Enough of this for the present, till we look at *Both Sides* for a short time. On p. 21 the writer gives *his* definition of "sign" and "type," as follows:

"A sign is one thing, a type or shadow is entirely another and a different thing. A sign is simply that by which a certain relation or state is signified; a type is that which foreshadows, or points forward to, something. Types always point forward, but the Sabbath as a sign between God and Israel, pointed back to the works of creation."

But does my opponent believe that the Sabbath is a sign? So he says. And on pp. 16 and 22 we find him very much animated at the idea; it makes him even to "rejoice," to think that it is so. He says:

"We shall *not*, therefore, deny that the Sabbath was a sign unto the children of Israel. We will take as literally as any of our opponents could wish, everything that the Bible says about the Sabbath's being a sign between God and Israel, or, if they like it any better, between God and the Jews. * * * For our own part, we rejoice that the Sabbath was a sign between God and Israel."

Good. But on p. 26 he says:

"We do not believe the Sabbath is a type pointing forward to our future rest, but a memorial looking back to creation; for the Scriptures uniformly and expressly so represent it."

Mark the language: *"looking back!"* This is the difference between us: *he* believes the Sabbath to be a "sign between God and *the children of Israel;*" but as he says, always pointing, or "looking back, to creation!" Wonderful employment, this! The Christian spending his Sabbaths IN "LOOKING BACK TO CREATION!" But I believe it is a "sign or type," pointing forward to that Sabbath, or "rest, that remains to the people of God;" and this is the way, as Isaiah says, that God has been "declaring the end from the beginning."

"But hold, friend P. (says *Both Sides*, p. 30): for the origin of the Sabbath is the *very point* that *determines* whether the Sabbath is a type or not; and to ignore this, is begging the whole question."

This, with other statements from *Both Sides*, shows that the writer *guessed* that I believe the Sabbath had its origin after the Exodus. But it so happens that I believe its origin was at the creation; and of course I do not "ignore this," neither am I "begging the whole question." But the writer continues:

"If the Sabbath originated with types, and rests on the same basis, and belongs to the same system with them, then it is a type, the controversy is ended, and we will never more take up our pen to argue its obligation upon Gospel Christians."

Reader, mark well, and remember *this promise.* Will he keep it? We shall see. The writer still continues and says:

"But if the Sabbath originated far back of all types and shadows, if it rests on a different basis altogether, and is infinitely higher in its nature, and sustains an universal relation to all the inhabitants of this earth, then verily it is not a type, and no man can rightfully attempt to degrade it into a typical office."

On p. 33 he again says:

"All types point forward to something connected with the work of redemption. They have no other design than this. Hence, no type would ever have been introduced had not man fallen and needed a redemption. They all originate, therefore, this side of the fall."

And on p. 217 it is said.

"It is impossible that any type should originate before the fall."

Here, then, let us test these bold assertions, that all types originated "*this side of the fall;*" with a reference to the Greek. In Romans 5: 14 we read:

"Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the *figure* [*tupos*, or type] of him that was to come."

This proves that *Adam* was a *tupos*, or "type," of *Christ;* notwithstanding the "universal and unqualified denial" to the contrary! And which was the oldest, Adam, or the Sabbath? And if "no type can cease until its antitype is reached," as *Both Sides* says, then Adam must have lived to be a very *old man*—FOUR THOUSAND YEARS OLD! And how could "all types" "originate" "THIS SIDE THE FALL," if Adam was a *tupos* of Christ? And is it "IMPOSSIBLE

that any type should originate BEFORE the fall?" Who is *entangled in the Greek!*" But let the reader remember, that *Both Sides* has positively asserted that "all types point forward to something connected with the work of redemption." We will test this. As for the Old Testament I have not been able yet to find the word "*type*," in our English version; or a word which answers to it in the Hebrew Scriptures except the word *sign* (Heb. *oth*). But in the New Testament, we have the Greek *seemion*, sign; and *tupos*, type: the definitions of which have already been given. We will now turn our attention to the *use* of the word *tupos*, as found in the New Testament, and see if "all types point forward to something connected with the work of redemption." This word *tupos* is found *sixteen times* in the New Testament. It is rendered as follows: *print*, twice; *figure*, once; *figures*, once; *fashion*, once; *manner*, once; *form*, once; *examples*, once; *ensamples*, three times; *ensample*, three times; *pattern*, twice. With a little attention to these examples of the use of *tupos*, the reader will readily perceive that the word *tupos*, or "type," does *not* always "point forward to something connected with the work of redemption." But to be more particular, we will examine these words, sign or type, and prove that our use of them is not "covertly insinuating that they mean one and the same thing;" but plainly show that they do sometimes "mean one and the same thing." This has already

been abundantly proved, it would seem, by Greenfield's and Webster's definitions. But by examining their *use* in the New Testament, we believe it will satisfy all candid minds that the word *sign* does not always point *backward;* and *type* always point *forward:* but they sometimes "mean one and the same thing." The word *seemion*, or "sign," occurs about *seventy-five* times in the New Testament; and we will now prove that it is used to *point forward* to things, or events in the future, more frequently than the word *tupos*, or type.

For examples of the word *sign*, we will take the following:

"There shall no *sign* be given to it, but the *sign* of the prophet Jonas." (Matt. 12: 39.)

"What shall be the *sign* of thy coming?" (Matt. 24: 3.)

"This child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a *sign* which shall be spoken against." (Luke 2: 34.)

"As Jonas was a *sign* unto the Ninevites." (Luke 11: 30.)

"There shall be *signs* in the sun." (Luke 21: 25.)

"And *signs* in the earth beneath." (Acts 2: 19.)

"We received the *sign* of circumcision." (Rom. 4: 11.)

For examples of *type* [*tupos*] we will take the following:

"Except I shall see in his hands the *print* [*tupos*] of the nails." (John 20: 25.)

"Ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, *figures* [*tupos*] which ye made to worship them." (Acts 7: 43.)

"And he wrote a letter after this *manner* [*tupos*]." (Acts 23: 25.)

"But ye have obeyed from the heart that *form* [*tupos*] of doctrine." (Rom. 6 : 17.)

"These things were our *ensamples* [*tupos*] to the intent we should not lust after evil things." (1 Cor. 10 : 6.)

"Ye were *ensamples* [*tupos*] to all that believe." (1 Thess. 1 : 7.)

It will thus be seen, that the very first instance of the use of the word *tupos* in the the Bible, is in John 20 : 25; where it is rendered *print*, meaning "*a mark;*" precisely as Greenfield and Webster give the definition. And thus we have abundant proof that the word "sign" does *not* always "point back!" but more frequently points forward. And also when it is said that "types" *always point forward*, we find it is untrue by the examples just given. But if more proof is wanted in regard to the Sabbath being a "sign or type" of the seventh millennium, we have it at hand.

I have already alluded to Isaiah 46 : 10, where it is said that God has been "declaring the end from the beginning:" but I will now also quote the context, so that the reader may see its bearing on this subject:

"Remember this, and show yourselves men: bring it again to mind, O ye transgressors. Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me. *Declaring the end from the beginning*, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." (Is. 46 : 8–10.)

Now the question arises, *How* has the Lord been "*declaring the end from the beginning*?" It does not read *declared*, as though the work had been completed in some particular act or word of his; but "*declaring*;" that is, *constantly reminding* successive generations of this same thing. Or in other words, By what "*sign* or *type*" has the Lord been "declaring" this to all generations? In various ways he has done this. (1) By the teachings of his Word in almost every book of the Old Testament; and all the historical books, and the book of Revelation in the New. And (2) it appears to be seen in the very constitution, or organization, of man changing once in seven years, and also in other things connected with this present world. But *how* has the Lord been teaching this? is the question. We answer, By the divine number "*seven*;" as found in its various relations to different things; as the following will abundantly demonstrate. One writer has given the following, which relates to the great feasts of the Jews, their Jubilee, and their year of release; etc.: "On the *seventh* of the *seventh* moon, a holy observance was ordained to the children of Israel, who feasted *seven* days and remained *seven* days in the tents; the *seventh* year was directed to be a Sabbath of rest for all things; and at the end of *seven* times *seven* years commenced the grand jubilee; every *seventh* year the land lay fallow; every *seventh*

year there was a grand release from all debts, and bondsmen were set free."

But to show the strength of this position, we will take the book of Genesis, and trace it through to the close, and also the book of Revelation, the first and last books in the Bible. We begin with

GENESIS 2: 2: "On the *seventh* day God ended his work—On the *seventh* day he rested—And God blessed the *seventh* day—Whoever should slay Cain, vengeance would be taken on him *seven*-fold—And if Cain was to be avenged *seven*-fold, Lamech *seventy* and *seven*-fold—Noah had *seven* days' warning of the flood—He was to take into the ark of every clean beast by *sevens*, and fowls of the air by *sevens* —The ark rested on the *seventh* month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat—A dove was sent forth from the ark, and returned; and in *seven* days more another dove was sent forth—Jacob served twice *seven* years for Rebecca—Jacob bowed himself *seven* times before his brother Esau—The *seven* years of plenty, and the *seven* years of famine were foretold in Pharaoh's dream, by the *seven* fat and the *seven* lean beasts; and the *seven* ears of full and the *seven* ears of blasted corn."

REVELATION: "There are *seven* Churches—*seven* spirits—*seven* golden candlesticks—*seven* stars—*seven* angels—*seven* lamps—*seven* seals—*seven* horns—*seven* eyes—*seven* trumpets—*seven* thunders—red dragon

with *seven* heads and *seven* crowns—a beast with *seven* heads and *seven* crowns—*seven* angels with *seven* vials—*seven* last plagues—scarlet-colored beast having *seven* heads—*seven* mountains—*seven* kings."

Thus it is clearly shown that this "type" of "*sevens*" is "a mark," a "figure, emblem, that which exhibits a representation" of the "end from the beginning:" as the *seven* seals, and *seven* trumpets, and the *seven* plagues reach to the end of this dispensation; or to the close of the *six thousand* years of probation; and the commencement of the *seventh* thousand years—the great and glorious Sabbath, or "rest" "which remaineth to the people of God."

But there is still more proof connected with this number *seven*. There is the "*seven* times" mentioned in Leviticus 26: which relate to the scattering of the Jews; and this being prophetic time, amounts to 2,520 years: and carries us down also to the commencement of the Great Sabbath. It is also pointed out in a typical light, in the generations from Adam to Christ (or rather from "God" to "Jesus," as it is said by Luke, that Adam "was the Son of God,)" there being *seventy-seven*, or eleven times *seven*, generations. *Seven* generations from Adam to Enoch, who was translated, and *seventy* (or ten times *seven*) generations from Enoch to Christ.

But, again, this is pointed out in the fact that there were six times *seven* generations from the time that God made the promise to Abraham, that in his seed

all the nations of the earth should be blessed; before that true "seed" was born in the person of Jesus Christ. This is shown as follows: "So all the generations from Abraham to David are *fourteen* generations: and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are *fourteen* generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are *fourteen* generations" (Matt. 1: 17); making six sevens in all.

Now let us inquire, Does all this point "back to creation," and none of it point forward to the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began?" I think all candid, reflecting minds will see clearly from the foregoing, that the *seventh-day Sabbath* was a "sign or type" of the *seventh millennium*, or Great Sabbath. Will the author of *Both Sides* remember his promise which is found on p. 30? viz.:

"If the Sabbath originated with *types*, and rests on the *same basis*, and belongs to the *same system with them*, THEN IT IS A TYPE, the controversy is ended, and we will NEVER MORE take up our pen to ARGUE ITS OBLIGATION UPON GOSPEL CHRISTIANS."

But I doubt not there will still be found those who will "*deny it in toto!*" To *deny* a thing is quite easy. The old Pharisees could *deny* that Jesus was the Christ! Infidels can *deny* Divine revelation and the Christian religion! And it is quite easy to *assert* that, "The *typical* Sabbaths were shadows of things *to come;* the *seventh-day* Sabbath *was* and *is*

a memorial of things *past*. The two classes of Sabbaths point in *opposite* directions, and hence cannot be classed together. The one pointed forward to redemption; the other points *back to creation*." This was quite easy for *Both Sides* to *say;* but would have been hard to *prove*.

We will now examine one other instance where *Both Sides* has misrepresented or perverted the Greek.

On p. 173 it is said:

"In vain will that man come to the mercy-seat for pardon, who is knowingly violating any one of the precepts of the royal law over which the mercy-seat is placed; for our Savior in the very opening sermon of his mission was careful to give utterance to this solemn truth, 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that *doeth* the *will* of my Father which is in heaven.' (Matt. 7: 21.) The original word here translated 'will,' is *theleema*, which Greenfield in this instance defines, 'precept, statute.' Our Lord's declaration, then, is simply this, that only those who, in addition to calling him, Lord; that is, acknowledging his authority and heeding his teachings, should also do the precepts of his Father, could enter into the kingdom of heaven.

"And so important does the Lord apparently deem this fact that he does not leave it with being once stated. In the closing verses of the closing chapter of the closing revelation of the sacred volume, it is again solemnly announced: 'Blessed are they,' says Christ, 'that do *his* [the Father's] commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.' (Rev. 22: 14.)"

It will be seen by this quotation, that an effort is made to make the reader believe that the word *theleema*, rendered "will" in Matthew 7: 21, is the

same word found in Revelation 22: 14, rendered "commandments." This would be quite important to *that side* of the question, if the reader could only be made to believe it: and doubtless there will be those who will know no better. But it is *not true*—the words are different. The Greek word in Revelation 22: 14, is *entolee*. Now what is the difference in the meaning of these two words, as defined by Greenfield? The primary meaning of each word is as follows:

1. "*Theleema;* will; *i. e.*, purpose, design, intention; desire, inclination; that which one wishes to have done, the object of one's will."

2. "*Entolee*, a precept, commandment, law; instruction in one's duties; a command, direction," etc.

A few examples of the use of *theleema* will show at once that it is never used in the New Testament in the sense of "precept, statute," as *Both Sides* asserts. The word occurs in the New Testament *sixty-four* times; and is rendered "*will*" *sixty-two* times. In Ephesians 2: 3 it is rendered "*desires*." In Revelation 4: 11 it is rendered "*pleasure*." The first time it is found in the New Testament is in Matthew 6: 10, and reads, "Thy *will* be done in earth." In ch. 26: 42, "Except I drink it, thy *will* be done." In John 1: 13, "Nor of the *will* of the flesh, nor of the *will* of man." Again, in ch. 5: 30: "I seek not mine own *will*, but the *will* of him that sent me." Ephesians 2: 3, "Fulfilling the *desires* of

the flesh." In 2 Timothy 2: 26, "Taken captive by him at his *will*." And in Revelation 4: 11, "For thy *pleasure* they are and were created." Now let the reader just repeat the reading of the foregoing quotations, and supply the word "precept," or "statute," or command in the place of "*will*," and then say if he does not think that such a reading of the passages would "border hard upon nonsense!" We will here rest the case on this point for the present, and leave the reader to judge who is "entangled in the Greek."

MISREPRESENTATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.

Although there are many, we have neither time, space, nor patience to notice more than a few of the most important ones, as bearing upon the question before us. On p. 20 of *Both Sides* the writer says:

"But it was only to last through their generations. Who says that? Not the Bible, by any means. But how long a time is meant by their generations? Eld. P., *by a peculiar process*, attempts to cut it short at John or Christ, seemingly in doubt which. The testimony he quotes, however, to prove the length of 'the generations of the *children of Israel*,' unfortunately for him only reads, 'The book of the generation of *Jesus Christ*!' Are Jesus Christ and the children of Israel synonymous terms! The only definition that can be given to the word generation as applied to the existence of a particular class of people or a nation, is, the regular succession of descendants, from father to son. To make good his position, therefore, that the generations of Israel ceased with Christ, he must show that

not a single Jew has been born since the birth of Christ, but that through the agency of some stupendous miracle the vitality of the nation suddenly ceased, and the race expired with the generation then living! The generations of Israel have assuredly not yet ceased; and if the Sabbath is not now binding, it must be accounted for on other ground than this. But not to press this point, suppose we admit that the generations of the Jews, in a Scriptural sense, did cease at the cross."

Mark these last words: "Suppose *we admit* that the generations of the Jews, in a *Scriptural sense*, did cease at the cross." This is the "sense" in which I supposed I should have been understood—and so represented—and not in an *unscriptural* sense! But why does my accuser say that, "the generations of the Jews" "did cease at the cross?" This was not the place, or time, for their generations to cease in *any sense!* And I might turn upon my accuser, and say: "To make good his position, * * * he must show that not a single Jew has been born since the cross!" But why this effort to turn the mind of the reader from the true "Scriptural sense," as presented by Matthew in the first chapter of his Gospel, and Luke in the third; where is found the clear meaning of this plain question? Matthew reckoning the generations from Abraham to Christ, and Luke from "God" to "Jesus." And why does my accuser, *"by a peculiar process,"* attempt to make anything else out of this plain question, than the *fair* and *plain* "Scriptural sense?" Why this attempt to turn the mind of the reader from the real point at

issue, and thus fix the attention on the idea that, "THE RACE EXPIRED WITH THAT GENERATION!" when the reckoning of their *genealogy* is all that is meant in a "*Scriptural sense.*" And all the generations which are reckoned in this "Scriptural sense" are *seventy-seven* generations, before we reach the true "Seed," as has already been clearly shown, reckoning from "God" to "Jesus," as is found in the third chapter of Luke.

Again, on p. 103, it is said:

"Christ does not say that till heaven and earth pass, all the law should not have passed, or only a great part should have been fulfilled; but till heaven and earth pass, *one jot* or *one tittle* shall in no wise pass from the law. Not the smallest fragment should pass from the law, or change take place in the law, till heaven and earth pass."

Is this the result of "complete bewilderment?" or is it a bold perversion? Mark well how this is quoted: "Till heaven and earth pass, *one jot* or *one tittle* shall in no wise pass from the law!" If the reader will just turn to Matthew 5: 18, he will see that the author of *Both Sides* took the liberty to break off at a comma (,), *omitting the last four words* of the verse —"till all be fulfilled." And then, when he attempts to repeat the "Scriptural sense," he says, "Not the smallest fragment should pass from the law, or change take place in the law, till"—till what? *not* "till all be fulfilled," as the Bible reads—but "till heaven and earth pass!" Does the "seventh-day Sabbath"

rest upon a foundation like this? May the Lord spare his people from the influence of such deceptive teachings!

Again, on the same page, he says:

"'What commandments are these,' asks Eld. P., 'which the Savior speaks of in the 19th verse?' And he then endeavors to fix the mind of the reader upon the words which Christ was about to utter as the ones meant by these commandments. Now it would be most natural to suppose that Christ would give his commandments first and annex his remarks and penalties afterward, instead of referring to them by such expressions as 'these commandments,' as though the people were already familiar with them, when they were not yet given! But then, why should so small a matter as *reversing the order of nature* and common sense stand in the way of a theory!

"To speak seriously, it will be evident to all who have not *a predetermined view to maintain*, that 'these commandments' of which Christ speaks, are the commandments of the law to which he had just referred."

It will be remembered, that the above assertions, and accusations, were called forth in order to evade the force of my argument in favor of Christ's law of the New Testament, as found in Matthew 5: 21–48. He attempts to make his readers believe that I had a "*predetermined view to maintain*," and am guilty of "*reversing the order of nature*," because I said that "these commandments," alluded to in Matthew 5: 19, are those mentioned in v. 21–48. But it will be seen, that my accuser asserts that "these commandments," referred to in v. 19, "are the commandments of the law to which Christ *had just referred*,"

in previous verses. And as he multiplies many words upon this part of the subject, we will trace him to p. 107, where he says:

"He [Christ] had just said that those who broke one of these least commandments, should not enter into the kingdom of heaven. His charge therefore against the Scribes and Pharisees was virtually that they had broken these commandments. But what was the matter with these Scribes and Pharisees? They pretended to keep the commandments most strictly; how had they broken them? *Answer.*—Just as he accused them on another occasion (Matt. 15: 6), 'Thus have ye made the commandments of God of none effect by *your traditions.*' Hence, he goes on in Matthew 5 to arraign their traditions, or their standard of righteousness, before the true standard of the law of ten commandments," etc.

It is here taught, as above, that "these commandments," of v. 19, were those which Christ had taught them in Matthew 5: previous to v. 19. But let the reader examine, and he will find that there are no "commandments" at all "referred" to in this chapter, until we reach v. 19. I am accused of "reversing the order of nature," because I go forward *two verses*, from v. 19 to v. 21 (?), for the commandments referred to: but my accuser, as seen above, goes forward *ten chapters*—to Matthew 15: 6—for his support: and then says: "Hence, he [Christ] goes on in Matthew 5, to arraign their traditions," etc. An effort is thus made to impress the reader with the idea, that what is said in Matthew 15: 6 really took place *before* what is mentioned in Matthew 5: 19.

To whom does the charge of "reversing the order of nature" belong, in this case? Who appears to have a "predetermined view to maintain?" My accuser keeps on in his style of reasoning on this point, until we reach p. 110, where is found this bold—I had almost said, blasphemous—language:

"We affirm, then, that the New Testament is not the law-book of mankind; that there is no new principle of morality introduced therein, and not only so, but that the second commandment cannot therein be found; that is, there is no law in the New Testament to forbid our making graven images and bowing down to worship them."

Then after a labored effort to prove such shocking assertions, he says:

"We repeat, then, There is no law in the New Testament to forbid the formation or worship of graven images; and you who are teaching that all law is abolished but the New Testament, are practically, we do not say intentionally, breaking down the barrier and opening the way to one of the most heinous sins against the Lord Jehovah."

What shall we say in regard to such language as this? Is it the result of *"complete bewilderment?"* or something worse! And who, we ask, is *"breaking down the barrier and opening the way to one of the most heinous sins against the Lord Jehovah?"* but those who declare or teach the wicked, that *"there is no law in the New Testament to forbid our making graven images and bowing down to worship them!!"* But let us examine this, and see if the New Testament does not forbid the worship of idols. The following passages will speak for themselves:

"But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an *idolater*, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner: with such an one no not to eat." (1 Cor. 5: 11.)

"Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor *idolaters*, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." (ch. 6: 9, 10.)

"Neither be ye *idolaters*, as were some of them: as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play." (ch. 10: 7.)

"But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and *idolaters*, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." (Rev. 21: 8.)

"For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and *idolaters*, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." (ch. 22: 15.)

And notwithstanding all this testimony, and more that might be given; still, if *Both Sides* is to be taken as a standard work, it would appear that there is nothing in the New Testament to keep a *seventh-day Adventist* (?) from worshiping idols!! Is this the extremity to which *some* seventh-day Sabbath keepers are driven to maintain their position! Does it not look like "reversing the order of nature," because they have some "predetermined view to maintain?" Again, on p. 113, we find quite a novel way to misrepresent the Scriptures. It is said:

"This is admission enough. If the women rested according to the fourth commandment, that commandment was still in force to require and regulate such rest. But this was the day following the crucifixion. Hence the fourth commandment was binding this side of the cross. And if it was in force *one minute* after the crucifixion, it is in force still; for there is no other point where its abolition can be claimed. Notice carefully this point. It is irrefragable evidence of the perpetuity of the Sabbath in this dispensation. Here the Sabbath stands, this side of the cross, observed by the personal and intimate disciples of Jesus, and that, too, according to the fourth commandment! All this Eld. P. admits."

Pause, reader, a moment, and just think what this writer says: "ALL THIS ELD. P. ADMITS!" But what does this "*all*" embrace? Why, if the seventh-day Sabbath was "*in force* ONE MINUTE *after the crucifixion, it is in force still!*" "It is irrefragable evidence of the perpetuity of the Sabbath in this dispensation!" But there must have been quite a number of *minutes*, "after the crucifixion," before even the seventh-day Sabbath could commence; as Christ was crucified many *hours* before this seventh-day in question began. Was the writer so "bewildered," that he did not think at the time he penned the above words, that all who observe "the first day of the week" for the Sabbath, believe it was the *resurrection*, and not the "crucifixion," which is to be commemorated by the observance of the *first-day Sabbath?* And if so, we think it would not require a very strong, logical mind to perceive that more than

"ONE MINUTE" must pass "after the crucifixion" before the *resurrection* could take place! And we think most readers will conclude that the writer's "irrefragable evidence of the perpetuity of the Sabbath" in this dispensation is rather short-lived—only about "*one minute*"—and borders rather too much on a "visionary hair-splitting" theory, to claim the attention of the reader any farther. Again, on pp. 120, 184, we find him still saying more novel things by way of an exposition of 2 Corinthians 5: 17, as the following will show:

"'*If any man be in Christ*, he is a new creature, old things are passed away; behold all things are become new.' But how if a man is *not* in Christ? He certainly is not a new creature; to *him* old things are not passed away, neither have all things become new. So according to Eld. P. this new Sabbath is only for those who are in Christ, or who have been converted! and he who is not converted is still under the old dispensation; for there is nothing new to him, according to Paul. Our opponents will certainly add nothing to their cause, by applying to the change of dispensations language which was spoken exclusively of conversion!"

"Eld. P.'s use of 2 Corinthians 5: 15–17, to show that a new Sabbath has been instituted in place of the old, is absolutely ludicrous. This is the second time it has been brought up, and it is urged even a third time, as good sound argument to prove the point. Any theory that compels men to use Scripture in this way, gives evidence of being in great straits. In Revelation 21: 4, 5 we read of a time when 'God shall wipe away all tears from the eyes of his people, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon

the throne said, Behold, I make all things new.' Here old things passing away, and all things being made new, refers to the destruction of this old earth, and the present constitution of things, and the creation of a new heaven, and new earth. Does it refer to the same thing in 2 Corinthians 5? According to Eld. P.'s interpretation it does; for he says that from the resurrection of Christ, old things, without qualification, are passed away, behold all things, without qualification, are become new."

It seems that if my accuser can only be allowed the right to *qualify God's Word*, and thus give it such an "interpretation" as he pleases, he then can make this portion of Scripture apply "exclusively to conversion." But we choose to take the Scriptures as they read, "without qualification;" as we are not of the number who think the Word of God needs any "private interpretation" or qualification from finite man! And is it indeed so, that my accuser could really think his charge against us was true, in saying that, "according to Eld. P.'s interpretation," Revelation 21: 4, 5, and 2 Corinthians 5: 16–18, have the same meaning? Attention is needed here, to ascertain the correct sense of this passage in Corinthians:

"Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. Therefore, if any man be in Christ he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation."

What does the word "therefore" refer to, at the commencement of v. 17? *Answer.*—"Yea, though

we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more." "Therefore [for this reason] though" it was once proper to "know Christ after the flesh," as he was circumcised and kept the law, yet *now* we are to know him no more after the flesh, neither are we to know *any man* after the flesh, since what is declared in v. 16; *i. e.*, that Christ "died" and "rose again;" "wherefore," from "henceforth," no one is to be known "after the flesh"—not even Christ: because that system of divine service which knew Israel after the flesh, and Christ, also, has ceased, now we are to know them "no more," after this manner. The Greek word *sarx*, or *sarkos*, in this passage rendered "flesh," is found in the New Testament about one hundred and fifty times. Its primary meaning, according to Greenfield, is flesh—"the human body, person; in accordance with the theological opinions of the Jews, the body, flesh, considered as the seat and occasion of moral imperfection and vitiosity, as inducing men to sin through the influence of its appetites and passions; *i. e.*, that proneness to sin which has its seat in our corporeal nature." The following passages will illustrate the use of this word "flesh:"

"Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the *flesh* Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. Not as though the Word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel. Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but in

Isaac shall thy seed be called, that is, They which are the children of the *flesh*, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." (Rom. 9: 5–8.)

"For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh. Though I might also have confidence in the *flesh*. If any other man thinketh he hath whereof he might trust in the *flesh*, I more: circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the Church: touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless." (Phil. 3: 3–6.)

Hence, old things—the old dispensation—have passed away, and behold all things have become new. We are under an *entirely new dispensation.* The "all things" mentioned cannot mean the old sins of those who were once wicked, which have passed away; as in v. 18, the same "all things" are spoken of as being "of God," and "all things" of the wicked are not of God—are they? And if knowing man after the flesh means knowing *his sins*, the same would be true of Christ. We do not deny that the sinner becomes "a new creature" in Christ when he is truly converted to God; but this passage under consideration is not treating "exclusively" of the sinner's "conversion" to Christ, but of the old and new dispensation: "all things" pertaining to the dispensation of Death have passed away;" and "all things" pertaining to the dispensation of the Spirit are "new." And if knowing "*man* after the flesh" means that we have

known him once *as a sinner*, but now we "know him no more" as such; then the same must be said of *Christ:* for what is said of the one is, also, said of the other; and this would make Christ himself to have been guilty of sin once (?), but now we know him no more as a sinner!! But again, on p. 128, we find the following:

"When Paul was at Corinth he declared to the blaspheming Jews, that he would go to the Gentiles. Then asks Eld. P., 'Do we have any account that the apostle after this had any more meetings on the *seventh-day Sabbath?* Never.' Wait a moment. Was this the first time that he had declared that he turned to the Gentiles? By no means. Nine years before this, when Paul was at Antioch, in Pisidia, as already noticed (Acts 13: 14, 42, 44, 46), he declared that he turned to the Gentiles."

Then on the next page he says:

"Here was just as definite a turning to the Gentiles as the case mentioned by Eld. P. from Acts 18, and now we will inquire, Do we find the apostle after this holding 'meetings upon the seventh-day Sabbath?' Surely we do. It was after this that the apostles went out by the river side at Philippi for a season of social worship among Christians, as already referred to (Acts 16); after this that meetings were held at Thessalonica three Sabbath-days (Acts 17: 2); after this that Paul reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath at Corinth (Acts 18), and when he was driven from thence, entered into a man's house, named Justus, whose house joined hard to the synagogue, and continued there a year and six months teaching the Word of God among them."

The principal points in the foregoing are these: The writer says, "Was this the first time that he had

declared that he had turned to the Gentiles?" And then adds, "Here was just as definite a turning as the case mentioned by Eld. P. from Acts 18." Not so fast. The case mentioned by Eld. P. from Acts 18 happens to be quite different from the "case" referred to by *Both Sides*, as the careful reader will readily perceive by reading Acts 18: 6, where it is said, "from *henceforth*"—from this time forward—"I will go to the Gentiles." But in Acts 13: 46, it is simply: "Lo, we turn to the Gentiles." And so he did *turn* to the Gentiles. But in the other "case" it is: "*From henceforth* I will go to the Gentiles." And so from that time forward his labors were among the Gentiles, and not *any more with the Jews.* But *Both Sides* says of Acts 18: 7:

"And when he was *driven* from thence, entered into a man's house, named Justus, whose house joined hard to the synagogue, and continued there a year and six months teaching the Word of God among them."

The Bible does not say Paul was "*driven* from thence;" but "he *departed* thence," not into another *synagogue*, but into a man's house who "*worshiped God*, whose house joined hard to the synagogue." "And he continued there a year and six months," teaching the Word among them, who had "believed," and were "baptized." And there could be just the same number of *first* days of the week as *seventh* days of the week in this "year and six months."

It is said on p. 129 of *Both Sides:*

"Two years after this, Paul visited Ephesus, as recorded in Acts 19: 8, and went into the *synagogue*, and spake boldly for the space of three months."

Pretty long meeting, this—"*three months!*" Wonder if they were in the *seventh-day synagogue* all this time! And, if so, would there not be just the same number of *first* days of the week in these three months as *seventh* days? But my accuser concludes on this point by saying:

"Eld. P.'s assertion that Paul held no more meetings on the seventh day, after turning to the Gentiles, we have already followed into the ground."

But "Eld. P." did *not* say that "Paul held no more meetings on the seventh day, after *turning* to the Gentiles;" but he only quoted what the Scriptures say in regard to it: "*From henceforth I* GO *to the Gentiles*; and the reader can judge for himself who has been followed into the ground!" But we will here give what is found on p. 131, respecting meetings for worship on the first day of the week. The author of *Both Sides* says:

"Acts 20: 7 records a solitary instance of a meeting on the first day of the week. Let us look at this meeting, and see in what part of the day it was held, what portion it occupied, what it determines respecting the day on which it occurred, and how the disciples spent the remainder of the day. In v. 8 we read, 'And there were *many lights* in the upper chamber where they were gathered together.' Now it does not particularly concern us to know just how many lamps were burning on that occasion, and we are not told; but it does seem that the Holy Spirit has caused this particular to be recorded to show us that this was an

evening meeting. And if Eld. P. had looked at this meeting in the light of these lamps, we think he would have arrived at more correct conclusions concerning it.

"This one point is then settled: the meeting was an evening meeting, held *not* in the day-time, but in the evening of the first day of the week. Now in what part of the first day did the evening come? In the first part, or the last part? *Answer.*—In the first part; as according to Bible reckoning, a reckoning by which Paul and the disciples were governed, the evening was the first portion of the day. 'The evening and the morning were the first day.'"

The reader will notice that the main point which is dwelt upon in the above is the idea that the meeting mentioned in Acts 20: 7 was an *evening* meeting. And he expresses the opinion that "if Eld. P. had looked at this meeting in the light of these *lamps*," his conclusions would have been more correct concerning the time, whether *day* or *evening*, in which this meeting was held. Then he asserts: "The meeting was an evening meeting, held *not* in the day-time, but in the evening of the first day of the week." Then he appears to think he shall be greatly aided if he can only prove that the Jews commenced their day of twenty-four hours in the evening! But he had no need of this, for no one will deny it, I presume. But there was "day" as well as "night" included in this period of twenty-four hours; and we choose to look at it, not in the "*light of these lamps;*" nor in the *light* (?) of modern "*visions;*" but in the light of the Holy Scriptures. Turning to the

Old Testament we find the Hebrew word for day is *yohm*—as in Genesis 1: 5—"God called the light *day*." This word occurs about two thousand times in the Old Testament, and is invariably used when the *light* part of the *day* of twenty-four hours is referred to. And the actions, or labors, of men are generally spoken of as being in the *day* [*yohm*] or light part of the twenty-four hours. A marked distinction was kept up between *day* and *night*. (See Joshua 2: 5; Job 24: 16; Isaiah 5: 20.) The Hebrew word for *night* is *lah'-yil*, as in Genesis 1: 5. If anything took place, or was done in the *night* [*lah'-yil*], it is so stated and called *night*, not day; as may be seen by examining about two hundred places where this word is found. (See Genesis 14: 15; 31: 39; 32: 22; Exodus 10: 13; Leviticus 8: 35; Numbers 14: 14; Judges 16: 2, 3; 1 Samuel 19: 10, 24; Jeremiah 33: 20; 39: 4; 52: 7.)

In passing to the New Testament, we find the Greek word *heemeran*, rendered *day*, occurs about three hundred and seventy-five times; and if anything took place in the *light* part of the twenty-four hours, it is called *day*, *heemeran*, or *heemeras*. For *night*, the Greek word is *nux*, or *nuktos*; which is found about sixty-five times in the New Testament. And the reader can easily satisfy himself that if anything took place in the *night* [*nux*], the time was called night, and not *day*. (See Matthew 2: 14; 12:

40; Luke 5: 5; 21: 37; Acts 9: 24, 25; 17: 10; 27: 27.)

The Greek word for *midnight* is *mesonuktion*, as in Acts 16: 25; 20: 7. This proves that the meeting in Acts 20: 7 was a *day* [*heemeran*] meeting, and not a *night* [*nux*] meeting, although it continued until midnight. And we not only prove that it was a day-meeting, but we prove that it was a meeting on the "FIRST DAY"—not second day, or seventh day. "Prof. Hackett, Kitto, Prynne," etc., are not quite so good "standard authorities" as the Holy Scriptures; and therefore we feel quite free to "*deny*" that the meeting was exclusively a night meeting: it began the "first day" [*heemeran*], and continued until midnight of the second day, when Paul healed the young man who fell from the window; then he continued his speaking and breaking of bread *until* the morning, or daylight of the second day, or Monday, when he was ready to start on his journey, after having enjoyed a glorious Sabbath with the disciples. Their meeting continued through the "first day [*heemeran*] of the week," and also through the night of the second day of the week.

But perhaps the author of *Both Sides* will here wish to "make a little shift," and say that the *day* [*heemeran*] is not in the original. But let him, and his readers, remember his excellent criticism on pp. 118, 119 of *Both Sides*, where he proved that *heemeran* [*day*] *must be understood* according to the gram-

matical and critical use of the Greek language, which we have already quoted. Thank the Lord for the true "light" that shines out here in favor of the *first* day of the week as being the true Christian Sabbath.

On p. 133 he continues:

"It was in this same year, A. D. 59, that Paul gave instruction to the Church at Corinth, as he had before to the Churches of Galatia, to lay by them in store upon the first day of the week, for purposes of religious charity, directions which involve the necessity of reviewing their secular business, counting up their worldly gains, to see to what extent the Lord had prospered them, and determining what part they could devote to the wants of their brethren: work which would well commence the secular business of the week, but would be wholly inadmissible for the Sabbath, which is to be devoted to religious rest and worship, and a scrupulous dismissal of all worldly cares and considerations.

"If any should say that the language, 'lay by him in store,' means a collection in the public congregation, and that therefore meetings must have been regularly held on the first day of the week, we reply that the original will not admit of any such idea. The Greek of the expression is *para heaut-o;* and Greenfield in his Lexicon translates these words thus: 'with one's self; that is, *at home.*' From this it is apparent that what Paul here commanded was a private transaction, to be accomplished by each one at home, and not involving the idea of a public meeting at all."

We admit that it means they were to "lay by him in store," or in other words, let each lay by *himself at home* as God had prospered him. Although the original Greek does not favor the idea of a *public* collection, *every Sabbath,* yet it will greatly aid us in

regard to the true import of the apostle's language as given in 1 Corinthians 16: 1–4:

"And concerning the COLLECTION which is for THE SAINTS; as I directed the CONGREGATIONS OF GALATIA, so also do you. Every first day of the week, let each of you lay something by itself, depositing as he may be prospered, so that when I come collections may not be then made." (*Emp. Diaglott.*)

The Greek word rendered *collection* in v. 1 is *logias*—in the *singular* number. But the word in v. 2 is *logiai*—plural, *collections*. This proves that there was to be one *general collection* for the poor saints at Jerusalem; but in making up this general collection there would be a necessity of the brethren laying by themselves on each successive Sabbath, or "first day," as God had prospered them during the last six working days; and thus it could all be put into the treasury, and then there would be no *collections* [plural], or "gathering," needed when Paul should come, as it would be already for him, in the treasury.

And this *laying by*, being on the *first day of the week* [*Sabbaton*], is conclusive evidence that *this was the day* on which they *rested from labor*—and not on the seventh day. The reason is this: if they were to lay by as God had prospered them during the *six working days*, then the whole six working days, including the *seventh day* of the week must have been worked out, or they could not tell how God *had prospered them*, so as to lay it by on the "*first day*." Here, again, the true "light" shines on

this glorious subject, proving that the "first day of the week" was with the apostles the REST DAY—THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH. And let all the people of God say, AMEN. But on p. 101 it is said:

"The first day of the week having taken the place of the Sabbath, there is not only no testimony to any such effect, but the first day does not possess one single feature which it must possess in order to be a Sabbath. 1. No divine being ever rested upon it, of which we have any record. 2. No blessing was ever placed upon it. 3. It was never sanctified or set apart for man's use. 4. There is no command found anywhere in the Bible for its observance. The first law that was ever given in support of Sunday, was the decree of Constantine, A. D. 321, which was issued in behalf of that day as a heathen festival. (See *History of the Sabbath.*) 5. No Bible writer has ever set us the example of resting on that day. 6. Every mention of the first day of the week in the New Testament, is an allusion to it as a day for secular business, and not for religious rest or worship. 7. There is no intimation that that day, or any other, was ever to take the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. Under these circumstances, those who are endeavoring to bolster up such an institution, are simply daubing their wall with untempered mortar, and constructing a refuge of lies."

But when did Christ finish his work? Was it on the cross? or when he rose from the dead? See 2 Timothy 1: 10:

"But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel."

Here, then, was when *his work* of redemption was completed; when he brought life and immortality to

light through the Gospel, on the *first day of the week.* AND ON THIS DAY HE RESTED FROM ALL HIS WORK, IN THIS WORLD, FOR THE REDEMPTION OF MAN. Let us examine and see if we can tell who is "constructing a refuge of lies." The writer says, concerning the "first day:"

"1. No divine being ever rested upon it."
"2. No blessing was ever placed upon it."
"3. It was never sanctified."

But let us compare this with Hebrews 4: 10: "He [Christ] ALSO hath ceased from his own work, AS God did from his."

1. Did God "rest" on the "seventh day?" Then did Christ "REST" on the first day AS God did from his on the seventh?

2. Did God "BLESS" the seventh day on which *he* "rested?" On Hebrews 4: 10 Boothroyd says:

"*For he who*] For he, Christ the Lord, who hath entered, &c. He hath rested from his work of redemption, from his trials and sufferings, as God did from his works of creation, and is now seated at the right hand of the Father, enjoying rest in heaven, and the highest satisfaction in the work he has accomplished. For the sense given, see Owen, and Wardlaw."

Then must Christ have "BLESSED" the "first day," if *he* rested AS God rested—"*because*" that in it "he had rested;" therefore *he* [Christ] "*blessed*" it [the first day] AS God did the seventh.

3. Did God "*sanctify*" the seventh day? Then must Christ have "*sanctified*" the "first day," or he

could not have rested on a *sanctified* day AS God did, unless he had sanctified the day. And all the other assertions under this head will compare with the above, as will be seen by any one who will carefully examine this matter.

But says the objector, He did not rest on that day, for he went with his disciples to Emmaus. Did the Lord Jehovah *cease from all motion*—become perfectly inactive—and do nothing on the seventh day after the creation? Not at all. *He only rested from his work of creation.* Thus Christ rested from *his work of redemption.*

THE TWO COVENANTS.

On p. 145 of *Both Sides* it is said:

"The first covenant was made with Israel when they came out of Egypt (Heb. 8: 9); but the ten commandments existed from the beginning, and were binding on man from Adam down."

This will contradict Romans 5: 13, 20: "For till the law sin was in the world, but sin is not accounted where there is no law." "And law supervened, so that the OFFENCE might abound; but where SIN abounded, *favor* superabounded." (See *Diaglott.*) But were the ten commandments given to Adam? We shall see. This would make it the "*first covenant,*" to all intents and purposes; for in this case, if they were given to Adam, the covenant of the ten commandments would be before the cove-

nant relating to the flood (Gen. 6: 18; 9: 8–17), or covenants of promise to Abraham. (Gen. 17: 2, 4, 7–22.) This proves a little too much for the benefit of "Seventh-day Adventists."

On p. 149 it is said:

"We have seen that the old covenant consisted of the arrangement by which sins were taken away in figure; and as the new covenant results in our sins being remembered no more, the only conclusion left us is, that it is some arrangement by which our sins are taken away in fact. In other words, it is the Gospel, the superior sacrifice, service, and ministration of this dispensation, by which sins can be in reality pardoned."

Then on p. 151:

"Now what law is this, which under the new covenant was to be written in the hearts of his people? *Answer.*—The same law, beyond controversy, which God in the days of Jeremiah could call his law; and no one can deny but that was the ten commandments. Mark also the declaration of God that *he* will write it in the hearts of his people. God is ever the writer of his own law. Under the first covenant *he* wrote it on two tables of stone; and under the new *he* writes it on the fleshly tables of the heart. Hence the very prophecy that declared that a new covenant should be made, declared also that under that covenant, the ten commandments should be written in the hearts of the children of God."

Thank *Both Sides* for this admission, for it establishes just what we believe. Mark what he says: "Under the first covenant *he* wrote it on two tables of stone; under the new *he* writes it on the fleshly tables of the heart." But how can *Both Sides* reconcile such a statement with the language just quoted

above, where he says, "Moses wrote the first in a book." But again he says (p. 151):

"If we are living under the new covenant, as we certainly are, here are the ten commandments in all their life and power; not shut away from us by being enclosed in an earthly ark, as under the shadowy dispensation of old, but brought home to every true believer by being stamped with the Spirit of God upon his heart. And he who has not this law thus written in his heart, cannot be in covenant relation with the God of this new covenant."

Yes, so we say, and will repeat, "In all their life and power;" but not as written in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart. Thus the reader will see that *Both Sides* admits all we claim. But once more let us listen to what is said (pp. 151–2):

"Under the former dispensation the ministration pertaining to those commandments was the ministration of death, under this, it is the ministration of the Spirit. Under the old covenant there was a real law that had been transgressed, hence, real guilt, demanding a real atonement; but a real atonement could not be made with the blood of beasts, which was the only blood provided by that covenant: hence, the necessity of a new covenant which should provide a real atonement that could take away real guilt. Thus the old covenant had reference to the ten commandments, by taking away man's transgression of them, in figure. The new covenant has relation to the same commandments by taking away man's transgression of them, in fact."

Mark well this admission, especially these words which we repeat: "*Thus the old covenant had reference to the ten commandments, by taking away man's transgression of them, in figure. The* NEW

COVENANT *has relation to the* SAME COMMANDMENTS *by taking away man's transgression of them, in fact.*"

SELF CONTRADICTIONS.

We will now give a few of the self-contradictions found in *Both Sides:* for it states things in one place which are denied in another. On p. 37 it is said:

"The fact, therefore, that we are now living under the ministration of the Spirit, has no bearing on the question of the abolition or doing away of the law, further than this: It shows that some law must be still in existence. Without a law there can be no ministration. If there is a ministration, there must be something to be ministered. What law it is of which we now have the ministration of the Spirit, we shall presently show."

About three lines below, it is said:

"We advocate no law that has no penalty. Death ever was and is the penalty of the violation of the law of God."

What does the writer mean by saying that "death ever was and is the penalty of the violation of the law of God?" Death *is not now* the penalty; but the second death *will be* the penalty. Again on p. 38 it is said:

"Eld. P. has every commandment except the fourth binding in this dispensation without the death penalty."

Again on p. 40 he says:

"For the law that Eld. P. now has binding, is EXACTLY IDENTICAL with the Decalogue of the Old Testament, except

that another day has absorbed the sacredness and clothed itself with the obligations of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment."

Notice this:

"The law that Eld. P. now has binding is EXACTLY IDENTICAL with the Decalogue," etc.

And on. p. 55 he also says:

"Eld. P. speaks of the moral law of the Old Testament as 'the old law of works.' *Query.*—Does not his 'moral law of the New Testament' require the same number and the same kind of works? We venture to say that it does; or, in other words, that he has *every one* of the *ten commandments* in his new system, not even excepting the Sabbath, only observing it on another day."

These extracts show that the writer acknowledges that Eld. P. has ten commandments now "binding" "exactly identical with the Decalogue," &c. But on p. 51 he says:

"Then if God's law is fulfilled and abolished, and Christ's law is also fulfilled and abolished, pray tell us what there is left?"

And again on the same page he says:

"Eld. P.'s reasoning that the law is abolished, because the penalty of death is not now inflicted, has been sufficiently refuted already. His 'moral law of the New Testament,' we shall call for in due time. We venture to predict that it will puzzle him somewhat to find it."

But why cannot "Eld. P." "find it," as well as others, if it is "exactly identical with the Decalogue of the Old Testament," as is declared on p. 40?

Is not this plain, that *Both Sides* contradicts in one place what is said in another? It confesses that my view of the law of the New Testament "is exactly identical with the Decalogue," yet on p. 110 we find it boldly asserted that the New Testament is not a law-book of mankind, in language as follows:

"We affirm, then, that the New Testament is not the law-book of mankind: that there is no new principle of morality introduced therein, and not only so, but that the second commandment cannot therein be found: that is, there is no law in the New Testament to forbid our making graven images and bowing down to worship them. * * * We repeat, then, There is no law in the New Testament to forbid the formation or worship of graven images."

The law spoken of in Matthew 5: 21–48 not only shows that "*new principles* were *added* by our Savior, but it also shows that Christ included the *civil* law with that of the ten commandments. And is there "no new principle of morality introduced" in the New Testament? In Matthew 5: 22–27 is there "no new principle of morality introduced" by the Savior in his comments upon the sixth commandment? And following the seventh commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," as found in v. 27, is there "no new principle of morality introduced in the five verses following? And this last shows that the *moral* and *civil* laws are connected; as the law of *divorce* is not mentioned in the ten commandments. On p. 59 it is said:

"No Seventh-day Adventist expects salvation through keep-

ing the Sabbath, or any other of the ten commandments. * * * We repeat again, we seek no justification through the law in any sense."

Why, then, do Seventh-day Adventists have so much to say about the "third angel's message," and "the commandments of God," and "Ellen G. White's visions," if they do not "expect salvation through keeping the Sabbath, or any other of the ten commandments?" But let us examine this point and see what he *says*. It may be difficult for us to tell what the man "*expects*," but we can tell what he *says*. Hear him:

"Should the inquiry be raised how we would apply Paul's language, the answer is not difficult: The law requiring perfect obedience, we, having transgressed it, can never by our future obedience make up for our past transgressions: for no man can ever render more than perfect obedience, and perfect obedience only meets the present requirements of the law." (p. 53.) * * * "The law is the *standard* of righteousness." * * * "Christ does not make us righteous by breaking down *God's great standard* of righteousness, so that it cannot be shown who is a sinner, but by opening a way whereby our characters can be made to conform to that standard." (p. 62.) * * * "Remember then that our position is, that the moral law, summarily contained in the ten commandments, *is*, and ever has been, *God's great constitution for the government of this world;* that these commandments have, from Eden down, been *binding*, not upon any particular class alone, but upon all the world, as Paul in Romans 3 clearly shows; that *this is the law* which God by the Psalmist pronounces *perfect* (ch. 19: 7); the law, the keeping of which Solomon tells us is the *whole duty* of man (Eccl. 12: 13); that this law is in no wise

affected, either in its character or duration, by the giving of the ceremonial law to the Jews, and the abrogation of that law by Jesus Christ, but that *it continues* right on, as an unimpaired whole, *binding* upon the world, and is to be the *standard* of character at the last day." (pp. 76, 77.) * * * "We find the law as a whole brought over into this dispensation, *still binding* upon the world, and the great instrument used in the *conversion of the sinner*." (p. 79.) * * * "We know sin only by the demands of the law." (p. 106.) * * * "The ten commandments * * * are moral, and are the *very foundation of* ALL REFORMATION." (p. 141.) * * * "Reader, can you approach the mercy-seat which covers that heavenly ark, before which Christ pleads his blood, while beneath that mercy-seat lies the holy law you have transgressed—we say, can you approach there with confidence, unless you are conscious that you are trying to *keep every precept of the law just* AS IT IS WRITTEN? And mark that the fourth precept reads, 'Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.'" (p. 161.) * * * "And when Christ came and introduced a new and better way of approach to God, he was careful to hold up the law of his Father, *unchanged* in the slightest particular, as still the great rule of rectitude, and the *condition of everlasting life*." (p. 223.)

But how reconcile the foregoing with the following? on p. 106:

"Now what is sin, according to Eld. P.'s new law? Let him show us that law, or at once and forever abandon the idea. If such a law exists, it can and should be produced. Hence, as Eld. P. has grown rapturous over his new law, we have been waiting for him to produce that law, show of how many commandments it consists, tell us when it was enacted, by whom it was enacted, and how it came to take the place of the former ten commandments."

We think it will take the author of *Both Sides* to harmonize such teachings as are presented in these last extracts with the idea that, "no Seventh-day Adventist expects salvation through keeping the Sabbath, or any other of the ten commandments:" or that they "seek no justification through the law in any sense!"

THE LAW AS A WHOLE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

It is said on p. 79 of *Both Sides:*

"We find the law as a whole brought over into this dispensation, still binding upon the world, and the great instrument used in the conversion of the sinner. * * * We would again remind the reader of the view which we hold to be truth, namely: that the moral law has been brought over into the New Testament as a whole, and is binding in this dispensation in all its particulars, and to their fullest extent, reaching even to the thoughts and intents of the heart." (p. 111.) * * * "The law containing the Sabbath has been brought over into this dispensation as a whole; that Christ in the strongest terms enjoined obedience to it." (p. 121.)

But notwithstanding all this, on p. 110 it is said:

"There is no law in the New Testament to forbid our making graven images and bowing down to worship them."

CONTRADICTIONS ABOUT JESUS CHRIST BEING ONE WITH THE FATHER.

ADMISSION.—On p. 99 it is said:

'We come down to the New Testament and find the Lord

Jesus Christ, who in all the purposes and plans of creation and redemption, *is one with the Father*, by whom also the worlds were made, declaring that he is the Lord of the Sabbath." * * * "In the work of creation and redemption the *Father and the Son are one;* and the Sabbath is as much the Sabbath of the Lord Jesus Christ, as it is the Sabbath of the Lord Jehovah." (p. 101.) * * * "And when Christ came and introduced a new and better way of approach to God, he was careful to hold up the law of his Father, unchanged in the slightest particular, as still the great rule of rectitude, and the condition of everlasting life." (p. 223.)

DENIAL.—And on p. 181:

"Eld. P.'s 'third witness' talks very strongly about 'the commandments of God.' He says that whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, *because* we keep *his commandments. These* commandments of God are spoken of in *distinction from the teachings of Christ.* Now what commandments are these? The same writer speaks of the commandments of God *and* the faith of Jesus. (Rev. 14: 12.) The faith, or teachings and instruction, of Jesus, is *one thing*, the commandments of God are *another and entirely different thing.* What are these commandments? Every candid mind will confess that they are the ten commandments."

Reader, mark well this language: "The faith, or teachings and instruction of Jesus is ONE THING, the commandments of God are ANOTHER and ENTIRELY DIFFERENT THING!" So it appears that the author of *Both Sides* teaches the doctrine that, "the *faith*, or *teachings*" of Jesus had NOTHING TO DO WITH ENFORCING THE "COMMANDMENTS OF GOD" (?)—the ten commandments—and of course, then, he would not, for this reason, *ever teach the observance of the* SEV-

ENTH-DAY SABBATH! Thank *Both Sides* for this. *Let Seventh-day Adventists remember this!* But let us just compare the above with the following from p. 188:

"The text which Eld. P. promised, to show that Christ is a lawgiver, we have not yet found, unless he considers it proved by the words of Christ, 'Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine,' &c. But all Christ's teachings, so far from proving himself a lawgiver, only show that he was enforcing the law, and carrying out the will of another. He referred to a law existing before his time, and declared that he came not to destroy or supersede it. He affirmed that only those who kept the precepts of his Father should enter into the kingdom of heaven. He repeatedly assured the people that the words that he spake, and the doctrines that he taught, *were not his own*, but his that sent him. (John 7: 16; 8: 28; 12: 49; 14: 10, 24.) And on the back of this, James declares (ch. 4: 12), that 'there is *one* lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy.' If Christ is a lawgiver in addition to his Father, there are *two instead of one;* but John, to free this matter from all doubt, comes forward and says that Christ, instead of being lawgiver himself, is the advocate between the lawgiver, the Father, and guilty man who has transgressed the Father's law. (1 John 2: 1.) No, CHRIST IS NOT A LAWGIVER. He claims no such office. He gave, to be sure, directions and rules for the government of his Church, but concerning the duties which man as the creature owes to God the Creator, and to his fellow-creatures, he did not legislate, but simply enforced the law of his Father."

And again on p. 212 it is said:

"In connection with this misstatement in fact we must mention a misstatement in logic, which Eld. P. has made in putting forth his effort to prove that the commandments referred to are the commandments of the New Testament. The clause

'and the faith of Jesus,' he says, 'proves that the command ments referred to, are those of the New Testament; for there was no faith of Jesus before Christ came the first time.' We would fain believe that from some cause Eld. P. overlooked the little word 'and;' for certainly no one who gets a clear idea of the construction of the language, can draw from it the conclusion presented by Eld. P. It does not read, Here are they that keep the commandments of God—the faith of Jesus; but the commandments of God *and* the faith of Jesus. The commandments of God are *one thing*, the faith of Jesus another. Now what is this faith of Jesus? We affirm that *it embraces all the precepts and teachings of Christ given us in the New Testament;* and if this be so, the commandments of God spoken of in connection, *are not the same thing*, but commandments brought over from the Old Testament. Let any one apply it to any other than the ten commandments if he can."

We trust the reader will have patience while we notice some things presented in these extracts. It is said

1. "*Christ is not a lawgiver!*" Let us compare this bold assertion with the Bible:

"Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail, nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for HIS LAW." (Is. 42: 1–4.)

Mark it: "The isles shall wait for HIS LAW."

In Galatians 6: 2 it is said: "And so fulfill THE LAW OF CHRIST." The Greek word here

rendered *law; i. e., law* of Christ, is *nomos*, and occurs about one hundred and ninety times in the New Testament; and is the same word that is found in Matthew 5: 17, 18; Romans 3: 31, etc.

2. It is asserted: "If Christ is a lawgiver in addition to his Father, there are TWO INSTEAD OF ONE."

But on p. 99 it is acknowledged that, "*in all the purposes and plans of creation and redemption,*" "the Lord Jesus Christ" "IS ONE WITH THE FATHER."

Both Sides also says: "But all Christ's teachings" "only show that he was enforcing the law and carrying out the will of *another*." But on p. 181 it is said: The "commandments of God are spoken of in *distinction from the teachings of Christ;*" for the teachings and instruction of Jesus is *one thing*, the commandments of God are *another and entirely different thing*." But still on p. 188 he says, Christ "*simply* enforced the law of his Father!". "Complete bewilderment," this!

CONTRADICTIONS IN REGARD TO THE ORIGIN OF THE COMMANDMENTS.

On p. 38 it is said:

"The ten commandments were first proclaimed by the voice of God from Sinai."

On p. 223:

"When the moral law was given to the world in tangible form, we behold the Sabbath, in its very bosom, the golden clasp to bind together the two tables of the Decalogue."

Again on p. 76:

"Remember then that our position is, that the moral law, summarily contained in the ten commandments, is, and ever has been, God's great constitution for the government of this world; that these commandments have, from Eden down, been binding." * * * "The ten commandments existed from the beginning, and were binding on man from Adam down." (p. 145.)

In two of these extracts it is said that "the ten commandments were *first* proclaimed" "from Sinai," or "given to the world in tangible form," when the "tables of the Decalogue," were given. In the other two it is said that "the ten commandments" have been binding "from Eden down," or "from Adam down." Let the reader here reflect a moment, and then say if the author of such incongruities should not be the last man to descend to a system of "visionary hair-splitting," such as is found on pp. 74, 113, 120, and 184 of *Both Sides.*

We will next notice some contradictions and misrepresentations in regard to the "*covenants,*" "*commandments,*" and the "law." On p. 145 is the following:

"Let us then inquire briefly into the question of the covenants. What constituted the first covenant? What the second? Are the ten commandments the first, second, or neither? There are many definitions of the word covenant, and there are various kinds of covenants. The word is defined thus: 'Any disposition, arrangement, institution, or dispensation: hence a testament, will; a covenant; *i. e.*, mutual promises on mutual

conditions, or promises with conditions annexed; by metonymy, a body of laws and precepts.' (*Greenfield.*)"

But on p. 147 it is said:

"We have seen from the definition given of the word covenant, that it primarily signifies a mutual agreement between two parties upon mutual conditions."

The reader will thus notice that here is a *contradiction*, for the *primary* definition of covenant [*diatheekee*] as first given is: "Any disposition, arrangement, institution, or dispensation:" but in the second it is, "A mutual agreement between two parties!" Which of these does the author of *Both Sides* like best? By turning to p. 165 we shall hear him speak for himself. But in order that there shall be no mistake here, I will first quote from the same page the definition I gave of the word *diatheekee*, or covenant; and then we will let him give his opinion of it, whether he likes it or not. In my argument as published in the *World's Crisis*, my definition was this:

"But a few words here in relation to this word which is translated *testament* in this last quotation. In the Greek this word is *diatheekee*; and it is found in the New Testament thirty-three times. It is rendered *covenant* twenty, and *testament* thirteen times. Its meaning according to Greenfield's Greek Lexicon is, 'any disposition, arrangement, institution, dispensation,' etc. Thus we are to understand this word *diatheekee* in the sense of covenant; and to mean the Lord's institution, or arrangement, to save men, whether it was under the *old* or the *new* dispensation. The first *diatheekee*, or covenant, written upon 'tables of stone,' is disannuled' (Heb. 7: 18); but the *dia-*

theekee, or covenant, written 'in fleshly tables of the heart,' is *now* for the benefit and salvation of men."

To this he replies:

"Eld. P. has here given us a good definition of the word covenant; it is 'the Lord's arrangement to save men,' whether 'under the *old* or *new* dispensation.'"

Thank *Both Sides* for this frank acknowledgment of the truth; and we hope he will abide by it hereafter. But there was a *cause* for this "little shift" in favor of his *second* definition: as the reader will readily perceive when we turn back to p. 147. The very next words which follow *his* definition of "the word" "covenant," which he says "primarily signifies a mutual agreement between two parties," are these:

"Do we find any agreement entered into between God and Israel when he had brought them out of the land of Egypt? We do. In Exodus 19: 5 we read that God made to Israel, through Moses, the following proposition: 'Now therefore, *if* ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.' To this the people responded (v. 8), 'All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do.' Here was a covenant entered into between God and the people. They made mutual pledges to each other."

This looks like being driven to extremities. But it is the only chance to escape from a complete failure of the main arguments in favor of the seventh-day Sabbath: for if the "first covenant," which is spo-

of in Hebrews, is the covenant written on the two tables of stone, which the Lord made with Israel when they came out of Egypt; then that has been made "old," it has *decayed* and *vanished away*. And it is easily perceived that the *primary* definition of *diatheekee* cannot apply to his singular covenant which he says is found in Exodus 19: 5, and can only apply to the covenant written on the two tables of stone. Hence the "shift!" But it will be seen that there is no real covenant made with Israel in Exodus 19: 5. But before giving the *proof* of this, it will be best to notice a few extracts from *Both Sides* bearing upon this point. On p. 145, immediately following the definition of the word covenant, as given by Greenfield, we find the following:

"What was the first covenant? Before answering this question we will offer a few words to show that it was not the ten commandments.

"1. The first covenant was made with Israel when they came out of Egypt (Heb. 8: 9); but the ten commandments existed from the beginning, and were binding on man from Adam down; and the principles of each one, especially the Sabbath, are revealed to us in the book of Genesis.

"2. The first covenant had ordinances of divine service and a worldly sanctuary (Heb. 9: 1); but the ten commandments say nothing about a sanctuary, or any system of worship. It must be evident to all that the covenant to which these things belong, must have something to say concerning them. The ten commandments have nothing to say, and hence are not that covenant. It matters not that the tables of stone were put into the ark, and the ark into the sanctuary; it was that system of

worship of which the sanctuary and its services were a part, not the ten commandments.

"3. The first covenant had a priesthood, and contained the laws regulating it (Heb. 9: 6); but the ten commandments have nothing whatever to say about priesthood.

"4. The service of the first covenant 'stood only in meats, and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances.' (Heb. 9: 10.) This being true, there was not one of the ten commandments in that covenant, unless they came under the head of meats, drinks, divers washings, and carnal ordinances.

"5. The first covenant was dedicated with blood. (v. 18.) The ten commandments were not so dedicated.

"6. Moses spoke all the precepts of the first covenant (Heb. 9: 19); but the ten commandments were spoken not by Moses, but by God himself from the summit of Sinai.

"7. The first covenant was written in a book by Moses. (Ex. 24: 4, 7.) The ten commandments were written with the finger of God upon two tables of stone.

"8. The first covenant provided blood which could, and did, take away sins in figure, but could not take them away in fact. (Heb. 10: 3, 4.) The ten commandments said nothing about blood whatever.

Here let us examine some points in this peculiar kind of logic. It will be noticed that the writer must first tell what the "first covenant" was *not*, before he can tell what it was. "It was not the ten commandments" he says; and gives his eight reasons (?) for it! and then says:

"We might continue this contrast to a still greater extent; and every time, we should find by what is declared of the first covenant, that the ten commandments could not be that covenant."

Now follows according to *his* theology what that "first covenant" was. Hear him (p. 147):

"What, then, did constitute that covenant? We have seen from the definition given of the word covenant, that it primarily signifies a mutual agreement between two parties upon mutual conditions. Do we find any agreement entered into between God and Israel when he had brought them out of the land of Egypt? We do. In Exodus 19: 5 we read that God made to Israel, through Moses, the following proposition: 'Now therefore, *if* ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.' To this the people responded (v. 8), 'All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do.' Here was a covenant entered into between God and the people. They made mutual pledges to each other."

But let us be a little more particular in regard to some things stated in *his eighth reason* in favor of *his* "first covenant." He says:

1. "The first covenant was made with Israel when he came out of Egypt"—"but the ten commandments existed from the beginning, and were binding on man from Adam down"—*about twenty-five hundred years before they were given!*

2. The "first covenant had ordinances," etc.; "but the ten commandments say nothing about a sanctuary, or any system of worship." We think it will take the author of *Both Sides* to tell what "Exodus 19: 5" has to say "about a sanctuary or any system of worship!"

3. "The first covenant had a priesthood," etc.;

"but the ten commandments have nothing whatever to say about priesthood." How much does "Exodus 19: 5" "say about the priesthood?"

4. "The service of the first covenant 'stood only in meats, and drinks,'" etc., but "there was not one of the ten commandments in that covenant, unless they came under the head of meats and drinks!" Is there anything said about "meats and drinks" in "Exodus 19: 5?"

5. "The first covenant was dedicated with blood." "The ten commandments were not so dedicated!" Was "Exodus 19: 5" "dedicated with blood?"

6. "Moses spoke all the precepts of the first covenant;" but the ten commandments were spoken "by God himself." Yes! there were indeed "precepts" in "the ten commandments;" but how many "precepts" (?) can be found in "Exodus 19: 5!"

7. "The first covenant was written in a book by Moses;" but "the ten commandments were written with the finger of God upon two tables of stone." But how large would be that "book," composed of "Exodus 19: 5!" A splendid "book," that!

8. "The first covenant provided blood which could, and did, take away sins in figure, but could not take them away in fact." "The ten commandments said nothing about blood whatever." "Exodus 19: 5," also, says "nothing about blood whatever."

But let us now look at the word covenant, in the sense of "testament" or "will," as commonly used

among us. When any one makes his "last will or testament" is it done by "a mutual agreement between the parties?" Not at all. It is often the case that the testator makes his will, and the party or parties know nothing of the matter until after the testator is dead. But in such cases, the testator makes his "arrangement," and in his "will" states what disposition he wishes made of what he is able to bestow upon others, for their benefit. A part of the definition of testament, as given by Webster, is all we need to give in order to throw light upon this subject, not only in a secular, but in a theological point of view. He says:

"*Testament.* 1. A solemn, authentic instrument in writing, by which a person declares his will as to the disposal of his estate and effects after his death. This is otherwise called a WILL. 2. The name of each general division of the canonical books of the sacred Scriptures; as, the Old *Testament;* the New *Testament.* The name is equivalent to COVENANT, and in our use of it, we apply it to the books which contain the old and new dispensations—that of Moses, and that of Jesus Christ."

Thus we see that in a theological sense, as is the custom among us we divide the entire Bible into the Old and New Testaments or covenants; not so called because there has been "a mutual agreement" between God and his fallen creatures in regard to them; but these Testaments constitute the Lord's "disposition, arrangement, or institution" for saving men under the old "dispensation." Is the great organic

law found in the ten commandments, or in "Exodus 19: 5!!"

It will now be in place to let *Both Sides* speak:

"We have seen that the old covenant consisted of the arrangement by which sins were taken away in figure; and as the new covenant results in our sins being remembered no more, the only conclusion left us is, that it is some arrangement by which our sins are taken away in fact. In other words, it is the Gospel, the superior sacrifice, service, and ministration of this dispensation, by which sins can be in reality pardoned. Hence, Paul says of Christ (Heb. 8: 6), 'He is the mediator of a better covenant, established upon better promises.' Why is this covenant a better covenant than the old?" (p. 149.)

"Paul carries the idea that it is because it is established upon better promises. And what are these better promises? *Answer.*—The promise that sins shall be taken away in fact, whereas under the former covenant they were taken away only in figure. There, remembrance was made of sins every year (Heb. 10: 3); but here, sins are to be taken away so as to be remembered no more forever." (p. 150.)

Good. But will the writer of *Both Sides* acknowledge the ten commandments are called a covenant? Oh! yes. On p. 144 he says:

"It is true that the ten commandments are called a covenant; and because there is testimony that some covenant has been done away, and there are scriptures which speak of the ten commandments as a covenant, our opponents put these two classes of Scriptures together, and declare that the ten commandments have been done away. This is a very illogical method of reasoning. Before they can offer such a conclusion, they should prove one of two things: either (1) that there was no other covenant but the ten commandments in existence, pre-

vious to the time when some covenant was done away, so that it must necessarily have been the ten commandments; or (2) that if there were other covenants in existence, the ten commandments are unmistakably the one which is pointed out, as done away. But neither of these points are proved by them; and hence their conclusion is wholly illegitimate."

But let us hear him once more on this point: commencing on p. 151 he says:

"If we are living under the new covenant, as we certainly are, here are the ten commandments in all their life and power; not shut away from us, by being enclosed in an earthly ark, as under the shadowy dispensation of old, but brought home to every true believer by being stamped with the Spirit of God upon his heart. And he who has not this law thus written in his heart, cannot be in covenant relation with the God of this new covenant.

"In our remarks upon 2 Corinthians 3, in relation to the two ministrations, we promised to show what law it is of which we now have the ministration of the Spirit. We here see clearly enough. It is the ten commandments. Under the former dispensation the ministration pertaining to those commandments was the ministration of Death, under this, it is the ministration of the Spirit. Under the old covenant there was a real law that had been transgressed, hence real guilt, demanding a real atonement: but a real atonement could not be made with the blood of beasts, which was the only blood provided by that covenant; hence the necessity of a new covenant which should provide a real atonement that could take away real guilt. Thus the old covenant had reference to the ten commandments, by taking away man's transgression of them, in figure. The new covenant has relation to the SAME COMMANDMENTS by taking away man's transgression of them, in fact."

Here we get the truth again. Mark well and re-

member it. He says: "Thus the old covenant had reference to the ten commandments by taking away man's transgression of them, in figure." Good again. Thank him twice for this. But how will he harmonize it with what he has said on p. 142? After saying:

"Eld. P. has here outstripped the most ultra of his no-law brethren, in the assertion that the old covenant was what was written on tables of stone, and *that only*,"

He then adds:

"We will show that not a syllable of what was engraven on stones was included in the old covenant at all."

Thus we see, that in this case he declares that "NOT A SYLLABLE *of what was engraven on stones was included in the old covenant at all!*" and yet on p. 152 he says, "THE OLD COVENANT HAD REFERENCE TO THE TEN COMMANDMENTS!" Oh! we pity this hard-working man; for it really appears that he has been "worried into complete bewilderment."

We have already quoted from p. 145, where it is said, that "there are many definitions of the word covenant, and there are various kinds of covenants." This is true. But there can be but *one primary* definition. Remember this, and as to the "various kinds of covenants," we have a few words to say. How many kinds are there? and to what do they relate? 1. The *Hebrew* word for covenant, is *b'reeth.* The first time it occurs in the Bible, is in Genesis 6: 17, 18, which reads thus:

"And behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven: and everything that is in the earth shall die. But with thee will I establish my *covenant:* and thou shalt come into the ark, thou, and thy sons."

The next is in Genesis 9: 8–17, where God established a covenant with "Noah," his "seed," and "every living creature." The first covenant which God made was not only made with Noah and his "seed," but "with every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth, with you from all that go out of the ark, to every beast of the earth." Was this "*a mutual agreement between two* parties!" And let us remember, that this is called "MY COVENANT."

Again:

"And I will establish my *covenant* between me, and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting *covenant;* to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." (Gen. 17: 7, 8.)

This is also *a covenant of* PROMISE; and is also called "*my covenant*"—*b'reeth.* And again we ask, Is this "a mutual agreement between two parties?"

In this place it is well for us to consider that there were *three* covenants of *promise* made with Abraham. The *first* in order is that in Genesis 12: 2, 3, which relates to "his seed" ("which is Christ," Gal. 3: 16), and embraces "*all families of the earth.*" The *second*

in order is the one in Genesis 13: 14, 15, also referred to in ch. 17: 7, 8, as above noticed. And the *third* is in Genesis 15: 18: "In that same day the Lord made a *covenant* with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates." But this covenant [*b'reeth*] was only made with Abraham, as particularly relating to "his seed"—his *literal posterity*—and was a covenant of *confirmation;* to confirm the second promise, or covenant; as will be seen by v. 7, 8, 13, 14, of ch. 15:

"And he said unto him, I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it. And he said, Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it? * * * And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance."

This *third covenant* has been fulfilled to the letter, as is proved by Joshua 21: 43–45:

"And the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers: and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round about, according to all that he sware unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed not aught of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass."

Thus these three covenants of *promise* are what Paul refers to in Galatians 3: 16; Ephesians 2: 12:

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed, which is Christ. * * * That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world."

Now to Abraham and his seed were the *promises* [plural] made: and are the *covenants* of promise. So when the Lord is about to deliver Israel from their bondage in Egypt, it is said: "And God heard their groanings, and God remembered his covenant [*b'reeth*] with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob." (Ex. 2: 24.)

But the Lord made still another covenant with Abraham, which was the *fourth* in order. It is found in Genesis 17: 9–14—the *covenant* of circumcision. This is the first covenant of "*works*" which is found in the Bible. But it is still called "*my covenant*" [*b'reeth*].

Now we are prepared to notice the covenant alluded to in "Exodus 19: 5," etc. It reads:

"Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel."

"And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord commanded him. And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord."

The careful reader will notice that there is no covenant *made* at this time; but there is a covenant *spoken of* as "*my covenant*" [*b'reeth*], which they must "*keep*," and if they did "keep" it then they should be "a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." Now mark, Abraham was to "keep" the "covenant" of "circumcision"—"thou shalt *keep* my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee, in their generations;" and thus, as the Lord said, "*my* covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." And remember, that this was the covenant of *works*, which they must "*keep*," in order for them to secure "*the land*," "for an everlasting possession." And, if they would thus "keep" that covenant, then they would become as the Lord said, "a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." And, *hence*, we find in v. 8, that the people said to Moses, "ALL *that the Lord* HATH *spoken we will do*." Not *will* speak—but *hath* spoken. And thus it is said, "And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord."

The term "*words*," spoken of here (Ex. 19: 6–9), is from the Hebrew word *dah-vahr;* and is rendered in v. 6, "the words"—v. 7, "words"—v. 8, "the words of"—and v. 9, is "the words of." This word *dah-vahr* occurs about 1,275 times, and is never rendered

covenant. Now mark what follows (Ex. 19: 9–11):

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee forever. And Moses told the words of the people unto the Lord. And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes. And be ready against the third day: for the third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people upon mount Sinai."

And why must they "*sanctify*" themselves against "the third day," as no other people had ever been called to do before? Because, the Lord was then to speak to them, *as he had never spoken to man before.* And what did the Lord say on this "third day?" The following is what he said:

"And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me: and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain. Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-

servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it. Honor thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." (Ex. 20. 1–17.)

Here are the ten commandments in full. And does the Lord call these ten commandments a "*covenant?*" Yea, verily! In Deuteronomy 9: 7–14 we read:

"Remember, and forget not, how thou provokedst the Lord thy God to wrath in the wilderness: from the day that thou didst depart out of the land of Egypt, until ye came unto this place, ye have been rebellious against the Lord. Also in Horeb ye provoked the Lord to wrath, so that the Lord was angry with you to have destroyed you. When I was gone up into the mount to receive the tables of stone, even the tables of *the covenant* which the Lord made with you, then I abode in the mount forty days and forty nights, I neither did eat bread, nor drink water: and the Lord delivered unto me two tables of stone written with the finger of God: and on them was written according to all the words which the Lord spake with you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly. And it came to pass at the end of forty days and forty nights that the Lord gave me the two tables of stone, even the tables of *the covenant.*" (See also, Ex. 34: 27, 28; Deut. 4: 12, 13.)

How far back were they to "remember?" "From

the day that thou didst depart out of the land of Egypt." What else were they to "remember?" "Also in Horeb," how they "provoked the Lord," when, as it is said, Moses "was gone up into the mount, to receive the tables of stone, even *the tables of* THE COVENANT which the Lord made *with you.*" "Remember"—"WITH YOU." And is there the least intimation that any other covenant had been made *with them,* "from the day" that they left Egypt, until the Horeb covenant? Not a word. Then there is *no covenant* in "Exodus 19: 5." But by turning to Deuteronomy 5: 2–4 this will be proved beyond all cavil:

> "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day. The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount, out of the midst of the fire."

But "perhaps" somebody may "*deny this* IN TOTO!" It may be said that this covenant, here spoken of, is not the ten commandments. But if the reader will commence and read from v. 5 to v. 22, he will find that all of the ten commandments are here repeated, the phraseology only being a little changed. *Great importance should be attached to this portion of God's Word.* (1) The covenant here made, is contrasted, by implication, with one made with their "*fathers.*" (2) These two covenants, the one expressed, the other implied, are the only ones the Lord had ever given to man to "KEEP," up to this

time. The "covenant of circumcision" was the *first*, and the covenant of the ten commandments was the *second*. Let the reader be particular here, and not misunderstand us. We do not say the only two covenants; but the only two covenants which God had given to man to "*keep*." Man should always keep all of God's *commandments*, and they are many, and various. But the ten commandments alone are the *only commandments* which the Lord had given to man *as a* "COVENANT." (Hebrew, *b'reeth;* Greek, *diatheekee.*) Hence, we see clearly, that both these covenants—the covenant of circumcision, and the covenant of the ten commandments, which the Lord had commanded Israel to "*perform*"—were covenants of WORKS—"YE SHALL KEEP"—and the only covenants of works which the Lord had ever given to man *in the form of a covenant.* Understaud us. We say, *in the* FORM OF A COVENANT. But now we come to another—a *third* covenant of *works.*

THE SABBATH WAS ALSO A COVENANT OF WORKS.

This we learn from Exodus 31: 16:

"Wherefore the children of Israel shall *keep* the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual *covenant.*"

Mark it: ye shall "*keep*" this "*covenant.*" This agrees with Galatians 4: 24; Romans 9: 4:

"Which things are an allegory: for these are the *two cove-*

nants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. * * * Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises."

What think you, reader? Was there any *"agreement between the parties"* in the making of these covenants? Again, in Numbers 25: 12, 13 we have what the Lord calls "my covenant of peace," and "the covenant of the everlasting priesthood." No "agreement between the parties" in this case. Again, in Deuteronomy 29: 1, we find another:

"These are the words of the *covenant* which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, *besides the covenant* which he made with them in Horeb."

No "agreement between the parties" here. Again, we find in Isaiah 42: 5–9 that the Lord Jesus Christ is "God the Lord's" covenant:

"Thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens, and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein: I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thy hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for *a covenant* of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house. I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images. Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them."

Mark this! For when Christ is given "for a covnant of the people," it is that he may be "for a light to the Gentiles:" and then it is added—"*Behold, the former things* ARE COME TO PASS, and NEW THINGS DO I DECLARE." Therefore, when "God the Lord's" covenant—JESUS CHRIST—shall "come to Zion," the Lord says, "My words which I have put in thy mouth shall not depart out of thy mouth" "from henceforth and forever;" as we learn by Isaiah 59: 20, 21:

"And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord. As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever."

It is impossible for this covenant to fail, as we see by Isaiah 54: 9, 10:

"For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of *my peace* be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee."

We also find another covenant made with David (Jer. 33: 20, 21):

"Thus saith the Lord; If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not

be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne: and with the Levites the priests, my ministers."

Hence, we can see that although "there are various kinds of covenants," as *Both Sides* says, yet only *three* were given to men to "*keep.*" And although the Lord made several covenants for himself to "keep," yet the critical reader will notice that there is not "a mutual agreement of the parties" in any case to which we have above alluded. The Lord gave Israel other commandments (Heb. *mitz-vah*) besides those embraced in the Decalogue. (See Lev. 26: 14, 15; 27: 34; Num. 36: 13; Deut. 4: 2; 5: 10.)

But let us now call the reader's attention to a point of vital importance in settling this whole question, in regard to whether the "law" *as contained in the Old Testament* has been "done away," by another taking its place in a new form. By passing into the New Testament we find that the Greek word *nomos*, rendered *law*, occurs about one hundred and ninety times. And, be it remembered, that *nomos* is *invariably rendered* LAW, whether it refers *to the ten commandments, the civil law, or to the ceremonial law. Or in other words, whether it is called the law of God, or the law of Moses. Both Sides* confirms this on p. 64:

"Paul in Galatians frequently uses the word law in a broader

sense than merely the ten commandments, and includes in it, those ceremonies which were connected with the transgression of those commandments under that dispensation."

But, says the objector, this argument contradicts what you said in your late published articles in the *World's Crisis*. Why so? what did we then say? It was this:

"What shall we understand by the term 'moral law?' That 'law of God which prescribes the moral and social duties, and prohibits the transgression of them.' We shall all agree, then, that the *moral* law is distinct or separate from the *ceremonial* or *ritual* law. Then the question arises, 'Is the old moral law, as contained in the Old Testament, now in force, or is it dead? *That* law is 'dead,' or, in other words, it is 'fulfilled.'"

Note the fact, that the phrase "moral law" is quoted. We did not intend it as our own language. And thus, when Romans 7: 4–6 was under consideration, we said:

"Here we reach a point of much interest. Two things in this last quotation require special attention. And *first*, here we *prove positively* that the law here spoken of is not the ceremonial, but the '*moral law*;' for we see by referring to v. 3, of this same chapter, that the *law* referred to is that which speaks of '*adultery*,' and this sin is the one mentioned in the 'seventh commandment' of the Decalogue; and this is what gives us the positive proof that the '*moral law*' is the one referred to. And *second*, we also *prove positively*, that *this* moral law *is* DEAD, as we find in v. 6 of the last quotation: 'But *now* we are *delivered from the law*, THAT BEING DEAD wherein we *were held*; that we should serve in NEWNESS OF SPIRIT, and *not* in the *oldness* of the LETTER.'"

On p. 50 of *Both Sides* the writer says in speaking of the above statement:

"We are gratified to find him admitting 'that the moral law is distinct or separate from the ceremonial or ritual.' In this he certainly bears away the palm for honesty, over those who would endeavor to create confusion on a point so plain, and confound objects so evidently and essentially distinct. We are no less gratified with his subsequent admission that this moral law is the Decalogue or ten commandments. Nor is our gratification lessened when he admits that the seventh-day Sabbath is a part of that law. Here, then, we understand him."

Again on p. 94 he says:

"We are more and more surprised at Eld. P.'s mode of presenting this subject. He has once admitted, as the reader will well remember, the plain distinction between the moral and ceremonial laws; but now we find him laboring long and patiently to break down that distinction and confound the two together."

This proves that he erred when he said, "we understand him." We think he *might* have understood *us*, but it appears he *did not*. What we said was this, We shall all agree, then, that the *moral law* is distinct or separate from the *ceremonial* or *ritual* law. So we still say. But why do we say this? Is it because there is no connection between the Decalogue, or ten commandments, and that of the ceremonial or ritual law? By no means. If the reader will review our argument on this point, and at the same time keep in mind the fact that the advocates of the seventh-day Sabbath make a graat point in

their theory by saying that the "ceremonial or ritual law" is abolished, but *deny* the other, they will perceive that our point was to *admit their doctrine* on *this* particular point as by them advocated; and *then prove that* THEIR "MORAL LAW" WAS ALSO ABOLISHED. This our accuser did not "*understand*," or if he did, he concealed the fact, and made what capital out of it he was able, by trying to make our position appear ridiculous before his readers. It is admitted that we were *not as particular* on this point as we should have been; but we did not think we should be misunderstood, and thus misrepresented here. But it appears the opportunity has been improved.

To illustrate our views of the ten commandments, as connected with the ceremonial, or civil law, we will take the case of the United States laws. (1) The Constitution is the organic law of the nation. So were the ten commandments the organic law of the Jewish nation. (2) All other laws of the United States, and of the several States, are based upon the Constitution, and must be in harmony with it. So all the laws of the Jewish nation, after the Horeb covenant, were based upon the ten commandments, and must be in harmony with them. (3) Laws of a common, or of a *sectional* character in harmony with the Constitution, can be added or repealed at pleasure, without changing the Constitution. But if the Constitution should be abrogated, all the other laws

go with it. So of the ten commandments; other laws, ceremonial or ritual, and civil laws, could be added or changed, if only in harmony with the ten commandments, without any change or alteration of the ten commandments, or organic law. But if the "national constitution" be abrogated, all the other laws go with it. This is the sense in which we say "that the *moral law* is distinct or separate from the *ceremonial* or *ritual* law."

But says the objector, Don't call the "ten commandments" the "national constitution!" Why not? It is so called on p. 39 of *Both Sides*, as the following will show:

"When a man under the former dispensation broke the Sabbath, or any other commandment, and was stoned for it, he was punished as an offender against the national constitution."

Thank the author of *Both Sides* for this. We are happy to agree with him occasionally.

But says the objector, We don't believe the civil, or any of the other laws, were *incorporated* into the laws of the "ten commandments." Hold a moment. On pp. 38, 39 of *Both Sides* it is said:

"The penalty of death, to be inflicted by the magistrate under the former dispensation, was attached to the ten commandments as a part of the *civil* code of the Hebrew nation. The ten commandments were first proclaimed by the voice of God from Sinai, engraved with his own finger on tables of stone, and deposited in the ark in the most holy place of the sanctuary. As such, they constituted a distinct law. (Ex. 24: 12; Deut. 23: 2.) They were especially '*God's* law,' which all

mankind, as subject to the government of God, were bound to obey, and for a violation of which they were answerable at his bar alone. These commands were also incorporated into the civil code of the Jews; and as such, penalties were attached, to be inflicted by the magistrate."

"We have shown how the Sabbath and the other nine commandments, aside from their existence on the tables of stone as the exclusive moral law of God, were also for the time incorporated into the civil code of the Jewish nation." (pp. 96, 97.)

We are happy to agree with him once more. Now we are prepared to resume the examination of the word *"law"* as found in the Old and New Testaments. The Hebrew *toh-rah*, rendered *law*, is the same, whether it is spoken of *before* the giving of the Decalogue, or after it; whether it relates to the ten commandments, the civil, or the ceremonial law.

Examples *before* the ten commandments were given: *"and my laws"* (Gen. 26: 5); *"one law"* (Ex. 12: 49); *"Lord's law."* (Ex. 13: 9.)

Examples *afterwards:* "And *a law*" (Ex. 24: 12); *"this law"* (Deut. 29: 21); *"this law."* (Deut. 31: 9, 26.)

The same is true also of the Hebrew word *mitz-vah*, rendered commandment—used the same, both before and after the giving of the Decalogue. For examples *before* see Genesis 26: 5; Exodus 15: 26; 16: 28. The same *mitz-vah* is found in Exodus 20: 6. Examples *after* giving of the Decalogue, Exodus 24: 12; Leviticus 27: 34; Numbers 36: 13; Deuteronomy 4: 2; 28: 45; 30: 10.

DID THE "BOOK OF THE LAW" CONTAIN THE "TEN COMMANDMENTS."

This is an important question. If it did, the "book of the law" is certainly destroyed; then where are the ten commandments, AS *contained in the Old Testament?* Are they in force now? This is a vital point with Seventh-day Adventists: for if they fail here—all fails them. See Galatians 3: 10:

"For as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the *book of the law* to do them."

Now if we turn to Deuteronomy 30: 10 we shall find that the "ten commandments" were written in the "book of the law:"

"If thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which are written in this *book of the law.*"

The word "commandments," which is said to be "written in this book of the law," is the same *mitz-vah* which is used in Exodus 20: 6, found in the very heart of the "ten commandments." Again, in 1 Kings 2: 1–3 this word *commandments* is from the same *mitz-vah*, and here they are said to be "written in the law of Moses." The Israelites had different copies of this book, as we learn from Deuteronomy 17: 18:

"And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his king-

dom, that he shall write him a copy of *this law in a book* out of that which is before the priests and the Levites."

This was to be read to the people "at the end of every seven years." And where was this book of the priests to be kept? "In the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord." (Deut. 31: 26.) To illustrate how the ten commandments, or organic law of the Jewish nation, was written in the book of the law, we will give the following. The original Constitution of the United States as written by the framers of that instrument is to this day kept in the archives at Washington, and few have the privilege of seeing the original copy. But, still, a copy of this instrument is given with the statutes or laws of every State in the Union: so that all classes of persons can have the privilege of reading it at pleasure. So with the ten commandments or constitution of the Jewish nation: the original copy, as written on tables of stone, was put into the "ark" made for that purpose, and the people generally not permitted to see it. But this constitution, or ten commandments, was also copied into "the book of the law," so that the people of every tribe could have access to it. And let us remember that the author of *Both Sides* agrees with us in this idea, that "the Sabbath and the other nine commandments," aside from their existence on "tables of stone," were also "incorporated into the civil code of the Jewish nation." (See p. 96.) But in the "reply" to us (p. 73) it is said:

"The law spoken of in Malachi 4: 4–6 is the law which God commanded to Moses in Horeb, for all Israel, &c. Was that the ten commandments? *By no means; for God did not command that law to Moses, for him to make known to the people,* but spoke it to the people, direct, himself, from the summit of Sinai; neither did he trust the writing of it to Moses, or any other man, but wrote it himself on the tables of stone."

But this word "law" is the same Hebrew *toh-rah*, found in Exodus 24: 12:

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there and I will give thee *tables* of *stone*, and a *law*, and commandments which I have written; that *thou mayest* teach them."

The attentive reader will perceive that *Both Sides* does not teach the same doctrine that is found in the Bible, for he says: "By no means; for God did not command that law to Moses for him to make known to the people!" But the Scripture just quoted above says to Moses "THOU MAYEST TEACH THEM." What shall we say to this? Shall we not be compelled to the belief that Seventh-day Adventists teach contradictory doctrines! But there is a passage in Proverbs 6: 23 that will help throw some "light" on this point of a connection between the "commandments and the law" of the Old Testament. It reads—"For the *commandment* is a *lamp;* and the *law* is *light.*" Now remember, that this "*commandment*" is the Hebrew *mitz-vah;* and the word "law," is *toh-rah.* And thus the organic law, or the *ten commandments,* were the "*lamp*" (or as the margin reads—the *can-*

dle); but the "*law*," whether it was the ceremonial or civil, gave the "*light*" to the Jewish nation.

That the Scriptures apply the phrase "*the law*" to both the moral and ceremonial, meaning but *one law*, is proved from the fact that the apostle in quoting from "the law" quotes from the "tables" and the "book" at the same time, as follows:

"He that loveth another hath fulfilled THE LAW. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, * * * therefore love is the fulfilling of 'THE LAW.'" (Rom. 13: 8–10.)

Here we see that, in quoting from "THE LAW," the apostle quotes both from the "tables of stone," and also from "the book of the law;" thus proving the fact that *they both* belong to what is called "THE LAW:" and this destroys the idea that they are two distinct laws, as some would have us believe. "*The law*" says, "Thou shalt not kill" (found in the "ten commandments"); and also says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (found outside the Decalogue): and the way the apostle quotes this, proves them to be but *one law*.

But when Christ appeared, it was said that he was "prepared before the face of all people, *a light to lighten the Gentiles*." (Luke 2: 31, 32.) Yea, he was "THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD"—and thus put the OLD JEWISH CANDLE OUT: and established,

or perfected, what is called in the New Testament "the law [*nomos*] of Christ" (Gal. 6: 2)—"the law [*nomos*] of faith" (Rom. 3: 27)—"the law [*nomos*] of righteousness." (Rom. 9: 31.) But did not the old Jewish "candle" accomplish its object? Yes, verily; and we will let the author of *Both Sides* speak and give his opinion on this point, found on p. 160:

"But nothing then perished that had not subserved its purpose, nothing failed of accomplishment; that sanctuary and that system had answered the end for which it was designed."

Still, he attempts a *sneer* at "Eld. P.'s" law of faith, "law of Christ," etc. But let his readers remember, that it is "Eld. P"–aul's "law of faith" (Rom. 3: 27); *his* "law of righteousness" (Rom. 9: 31); and *his* "law of Christ" (Gal. 6: 2); and not Eld. Preble's. We prefer like "Eld. P"–aul to "delight in the LAW OF GOD after the inward man," and serve "the law of sin" as little as possible.

My accuser says considerable about "the law of the Lord" (meaning the ten commandments), thinking it is perfect, converting the soul. (Ps. 19: 7.) If the reader will look at the margin he will see that it is *doctrine* and not commandments. But where are *the ten commandments* now written, in this dispensation? Are they written by God's "finger?" or by his "Spirit?" On tables of stone? or on fleshly tables of the heart? *Both Sides* on p. 151 gives the following as its opinion:

"Now what law is this, which under the new covenant was to be written in the hearts of his people? *Answer.*—The same law, beyond controversy, which God in the days of Jeremiah could call his law: and no one can deny but that was the ten commandments. Mark also the declaration of God that *he* will write it in the hearts of his people. God is ever the writer of his own law. Under the first covenant *he* wrote it on two tables of stone; under the new *he* writes it on the fleshly tables of the heart."

But Paul calls this old law "*the law of sin*"—and he does not seem to "delight" much in that, but in the "law of God"—and so should we. But as *Both Sides* has told us that "Exodus 19: 5" constitutes the "first covenant," we will let him now give his version of the covenant of the ten commandments. On p. 148–9 the author says:

"But the reader may be ready to inquire, what covenant the ten commandments are, or were, if they were not the first or old covenant; for they are plainly called a covenant. We answer, *God's covenant*, existing independently of any action on the part of man. To prove this we introduce Exodus 19: 5. When God was entering into that covenant which he made with Israel, while yet he was proposing to the people what he would do on certain conditions, one of his conditions was, that they should keep "*his covenant.*" This shows that God's covenant antedates the covenant made with Israel at Horeb; it was already in existence when that arrangement was entered into between God and Israel; and on the condition of their keeping his covenant, the blessings of the Horeb covenant were suspended. To keep his covenant was the same as to obey his voice. To obey his voice was to observe that law which he uttered with his voice from Mt. Sinai, the principles of which had existed

and were known from Eden down. Hence, we read in Deuteronomy 4: 13: 'And he declared unto you his covenant which he *commanded you to perform*, even ten commandments.' Now a covenant *commanded*, and a mutual agreement entered into between two parties, are two things. And this language being used in reference to the ten commandments, shows that they are an independent covenant on the part of God, owing nothing of their existence to any action on the part of man, but something which God as the creator and ruler of the race, enjoins upon them to be obeyed. Thus God's covenant, the covenant commanded, is co-extensive with moral obligation. The ten commandments are doubtless called a covenant on account of the promises annexed to their faithful observance; for in keeping them, as the Psalmist says, there is great reward.

"We have now seen what constituted the old covenant, and what kind of a covenant the ten commandments are."

We have in this, his full, clear (?) view of "what kind of *a* covenant the ten commandments are." And let it be noticed, that he calls it "*a* covenant;" but the Lord calls it "THE covenant." He says the "ten commandments" are "*God's covenant*, existing independently of any action on the part of man." Good! Thank him again for this. And it will recur to the reader, that we have mentioned some ten or twelve covenants, and in none of them do we find "a mutual agreement between the parties," but all were made by the Lord himself, "*independently of any action of man.*" He also says that, one of the Lord's "conditions" was that they should keep "*his covenant.*" But why did he place his emphasis on the word *covenant*, and thus pass over the word

"keep!" We have already shown that the Lord gave the Israelites *but three* covenants to *"keep;"* and these were the covenants of circumcision, the ten commandments, and the Sabbath. For the last, see Exodus 31 : 16. And again he says: "This shows that God's covenant antedates the covenant made with Israel at Horeb." Thank him again for this; for it is true that the first covenant given them to "keep" was that of circumcision; and this "antedates the covenant with Israel at Horeb"—the ten commandments: and this agrees with Deuteronomy 5 : 1–4:

"And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them, Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and KEEP and do them. The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day. The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire."

Again he says (p. 148):

"We read in Deuteronomy 4: 13, 'And he declared unto you his covenant which he *commanded you to perform*, even ten commandments.' Now a covenant *commanded*, and a mutual agreement entered into between two parties, are two things. And this language being used in reference to the ten commandments, shows that they are an independent covenant on the part of God, owing nothing of their existence to any action on the part of man."

Good, again; we are happy to see so much truth thus brought out.

We now pass to the New Testament. On p. 149 of *Both Sides* it is said:

"We next inquire concerning the new covenant. The terms first and second, old and new, are only relative terms. The covenant introduced by Christ is called the second and the new, only because a covenant had preceded it, which was the first, and which having passed away is the old in distinction from the new which remains. This shows that these two covenants have reference to the same general principles; for a covenant referring to one object could not be a first or second, as related to another which referred to an entirely different object. The great blessing declared to be secured by the second covenant is, 'I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.' (Heb. 8: 12.) Then the second covenant cannot be anything which makes known sin or unrighteousness; for unrighteousness and sin existed before it, and the object of this covenant was to take away such sin. Hence, the new covenant cannot be composed of any moral law, 'new code' or old, or any rule of life; but there must be such a law existing to show what sin is, independent of this new covenant, and distinct from it. This will be apparent to all minds; yet Eld. P. has here fallen into the *confusion* of making the new covenant the new code of laws, which he contends was given by Christ!"

Here is "*confusion*," sure enough! Contradiction of himself—and perversion of the Scriptures! Let us analyze. 1. He wishes his readers to understand that "the term first and second, old and new, are only relative terms," because "the covenant introduced by Christ is called the second and the new, only because a covenant had preceded it, which was the first, and which having passed away is the old in

distinction from the new which remains." We ask, To what, then, do these two covenants refer? He says: "These two covenants have reference to the same general principles." Very well; so be it remembered. And again we ask, What blessing is to be secured by the two covenants? He says: "The great blessing declared to be secured by the second covenant is, 'I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." Therefore, he says: "The second covenant cannot be anything which makes known sin or unrighteousness; for unrighteousness and sin existed before it, and the object of this covenant was to take away such sin."

Now we are prepared to attend to his conclusion of this whole matter. Hear it: "Hence, the new covenant cannot be composed of any moral law, 'new code' or old, or any rule of life.' Why did the author of such statements omit to quote Hebrews 8: 10, 11, and, also, the first word—"for," in v. 12? By looking at these verses the reader will be better prepared to answer the question:

"For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remem-

ber no more. In that he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away."

Thus "saith the Lord: I will put [marg. give] my laws into their mind, and write them in [marg. upon] their hearts." But according to the above conclusion of *Both Sides*, God's new covenant "*cannot be composed of* ANY MORAL LAW!" "*or* ANY RULE OF LIFE!!" Is such teaching as this the result of "complete bewilderment!" or is it owing to the necessity of the case, in order for Seventh-day Adventists to maintain their *visionary* views!

But what about *his* "old" and "new" covenants? Are these terms *not* used in the New Testament in the sense of the *new* being *older* than the other? We will see. This word rendered *new*, is the Greek word *kai-nos;* and is found forty-four times in the New Testament. A few examples of its *use* will aid us in forming a correct opinion in regard to whether it is used in contrast with something that is older in order of time or not. The first time it is used, is found in

Matthew 9: 17—They put new wine into *new* bottles.
Mark 1: 27—What *new* doctrine is this?
Luke 5: 36—No man putteth a piece of a *new* garment.
John 13: 34—A *new* commandment I give unto you.
John 19: 41—In the garden a *new* sepulchre.
Acts 17: 19—What *new* doctrine is this?
1 Corinthians 11: 25—This cup is the *new* testament.
2 Corinthians 3: 6—Able minister of the *new* testament.

Hebrews 8: 8—I will make a *new* covenant.

Hebrews 8: 13—In that he saith, A *new* covenant, he hath made the first old.

2 Peter 3: 13—Look for a *new* heavens and a *new* earth.

Revelation 2: 17—And in the stone a *new* name.

Bevelation 3: 12—*New* Jerusalem, which cometh.

Revelation 3: 12—My *new* name.

Revelation 5: 9—They sung a *new* song.

Revelation 21: 1—And I saw a *new* heaven and a *new* earth.

Revelation 21: 5—I make all things *new*.

So much on this point, to show the difference between man's *assertions*, and the Word of God.

But there is an interesting idea which we find embodied in the phrase "*will make*" as found in Hebrews 8: 8; where it is said, "I *will make* a new covenant," etc. The original word is *sunteleo*, and is found seven times in the New Testament, and has the sense of *complete*. I will give all the places where the word is found; and by annexing the words complete, or completed, all will be plain.

Matthew 7: 28—When Jesus *had ended* [or completed] these sayings.

Mark 13: 4—When all these things shall *be* fulfilled [or completed].

Luke 4: 2—And *when* they *were ended* [or completed] he.

Luke 4: 13—And when the devil *had ended* [or completed].

Acts 21: 27—When the seven days were almost *ended* [completed].

Romans 9: 28—He will *finish* [or complete] the work.

Hebrews 8: 8—I *will make* [or complete] a new covenant with them. The *Emphatic Diaglott* reads: "I will *complete* a new covenant," etc. The *Syriac* reads: "I will *complete* *

*** * a new covenant." James Macknight, and Samuel Sharpe also render it *complete.* John Wesley, Tyndale, Cranmer, and Coverdale render it *finish.* N. N. Whiting renders it *establish.* Wicklif renders it, *shall make perfect.***

This view of *completing* the new covenant shows that the *old* was *incomplete;* and the *new* was the *completion* of the work begun as contained in the old covenant. Some may have the idea from the phrase, "*will make,*" that the old covenant was entirely destroyed, and so an entirely new covenant made. But the word *complete* [*kai-nos*] helps us out of this difficulty. To illustrate this we will take the two cases to which attention has just been called, under the Greek word *kai-nos* , or new, as found in Revelation 21: 1, 5; where it is said that a new heaven and a new earth are to be made—or "I will make all things *new.*" Not all *new things,* but "*all things new.*" This shows that the old heavens and earth are not to be destroyed, but *made new.* But notwithstanding this, we see that the old heavens and earth *do not remain,* AFTER the *new* heavens and *new* earth are created. And so it is with regard to the two covenants; the old was not destroyed in the sense of annihilation, but has been *completed,* or perfected, in the *new covenant.* But the old covenant no more exists after its *completion* in the new, than the old heavens and earth exist after the creation of the new. And we know that *they* will not even "*come into mind.*" (Is. 65: 17.) This teaches us

that the "old covenant" should not even "come into mind," as being now binding on mankind.

But we are not yet done with contradictions, although it is unpleasant to continue them. On. pp. 150–1 we have the following:

"A word now in reference to moral law under these two covenants. Is it the same under the second as it was under the first? The second covenant was a subject of prophecy; and the prophecy has something to say about the law that should be binding under it (Jer. 31: 31–34): 'Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people.' Now what law is this, which under the new covenant was to be written in the hearts of his people? *Answer.*—The same law, beyond controversy, which God in the days of Jeremiah could call his law; and no one can deny but that was the ten commandments. Mark also the declaration of God that *he* will write it in the hearts of his people. God is ever the writer of his own law. Under the first covenant *he* wrote it on two tables of stone; under the new he writes it on the fleshly tables of the heart. Hence, the very prophecy that declared that a new covenant should be made, declared also that under that covenant, the ten commandments should be written in the hearts of the children of God. Why will not men believe this testimony, and cease their assertions that the law has been abolished, or their vain imaginings about a new code having taken the place of the

former? If we are living under the new covenant, as we certainly are, *here are the ten commandments in* ALL THEIR LIFE AND POWER; not shut away from us, by being enclosed in an earthly ark, as under the shadowy dispensation of old, but brought home to every true believer by being stamped with the Spirit of God upon his heart. And he who has not this law thus written in his heart, cannot be in covenant relation with the God of this new covenant."

After so much as has already been said bearing upon the point at issue in the foregoing, the reader will perceive much that is contradictory; but we need not take up all these points. We will however notice a portion. It is said: "Now what law is this, which under the new covenant was to be written in the hearts of his people? *Answer.*—The SAME LAW, beyond controversy, which God in the days of Jeremiah could call his law, and NO ONE CAN DENY but that was the TEN COMMANDMENTS."

So it appears that, we have *all the ten commandments* written in our hearts, in this dispensation—the Sabbath—that is the *first-day Sabbath*, and also the commandment which forbids *idolatry*—although this last *Both Sides* says is not *to be found in the New Testament!* But what law does he say this was? He says: "Mark also the declaration of God that *he* will write it in the hearts of his people. God is ever the writer of his own law. Under the first covenant *he* wrote it on two tables of stone; under the new *he* writes it on the fleshly tables of the heart." By this we see, that he intends us to believe that

what God has called *"his law,"* "in the days of Jeremiah," he says *"none can deny but what that was the ten commandments,"* which *"he* wrote on the tables of stone"—and is also *now "written in the hearts of the children of God."* But on p. 149 he says that the "new covenant," which he admits is written in the heart, and here calls it *"the law,"* cannot be composed of any moral law"—"or any rule of life!!" Hence, according to *his* teachings, the law he has "written in the hearts of the children of God" must be an *im*-"moral law"—containing no "rule of life" whatever!!

With the foregoing let us contrast the following passages found on pp. 140, 165, 170:

"Now has the old covenant anything to do with the ten commandments; that is, does the passing away of the old covenant affect the existence of the ten commandments? Not unless the old covenant was the ten commandments. But this Eld. P. has not shown and can never show. * * * Eld. P. has here given us a good definition of the word covenant; it is 'the Lord's arrangement to save men,' whether 'under the *old* or *new* dispensation.' Now if, in speaking of the first covenant, he would be careful to confine it, according to his definition of that covenant, to the arrangement that then existed to save men, he would save himself and his readers much confusion. But here we find him saying that the first covenant was written on tables of stone. But there was no 'arrangement to save men' written on the tables of stone. Nothing of the kind. * * * The fallacy into which Eld. P. has here fallen has already been pointed out. It was the *law*, not the covenant, which under the first covenant was written on the tables of stone; and it is

the *law* (Jer. 31: 33), not the covenant, which under the new covenant is written in the heart. On a distinction so plain as this, confusion is inexcusable."

This, we should think, would be enough to convince the most sceptical, that such contradictions, and perversions, are either the result of "complete bewilderment" and "confusion"—or something worse. Can the "visions" help him out of this?

On p. 157 it is admitted that "Paul is contrasting in the book of Hebrews, the two covenants, the old and the new." We are again pleased to agree with him in this. And let us take special notice, and not forget that he says it is the "*old*" and "new" covenants, which Paul is contrasting in the book of Hebrews. Now if we can find in the book of Hebrews that the first, or old, covenant was that which was written on tables of stone, then we gain the point in the argument, and all is lost in favor of the seventh-day Sabbath. Let us now examine Hebrews 9: 1–4:

"Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first wherein was the candlesticks, and the table, and the shew-bread: which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all: which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant."

Thus we see that the "*first*," or "old," covenant was written on the "*tables*." But what "tables" are

these? Not the ones mentioned in the second verse, which were in the sanctuary; but it was on those "tables" which were in "the ark of the covenant," in "the holiest of all," where was kept the golden pot that had the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded." And were these the two tables of stone which contained the ten commandments? Let 1 Kings 8: 9 answer:

"There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt."

Thus we have proved that the "first," or "old," covenant was written on "the *tables of stone;*" and this is the one that Paul is contrasting in Hebrews. Can Seventh-day Adventists see now that the old covenant is "done away?" *It is*, according to the admission of *Both Sides*. And if the covenant containing the seventh-day Sabbath is done away, then the seventh-day Sabbath is gone with it: hence, it cannot now be a holy day. Now let the author of *Both Sides* fulfill his promise which we find on pp. 8, 9, and 30, as follows:

"Prove to us that it is *not* holy, and we will immediately cease its observance. * * * When he [Preble] will prove what we have shown to be incumbent on him to prove, we will join him in his present position, and again observe the first-day Sabbath as in former years. * * * But hold, friend P.; for the origin of the Sabbath is the *very point* that *determines* whether the Sabbath is a type or not; and to ignore this is

begging the whole question. If the Sabbath originated with types, and rests on the same basis, and belongs to the same system with them, then it is a type, the controversy is ended, and we will never more take up our pen to argue its obligation upon Gospel Christians."

MISREPRESENTATIONS CONCERNING THE LAW.

On this point we will give a lengthy extract, commencing on p. 55, which contains an exposition (?) of Romans 7:

"We now come to Romans 7: 1–6. Scarcely ever do we read an exposition of this portion of Scripture by an opposer of the law, without being pained at the amount of unnatural effort expended to wrest and pervert this language of the apostle. Somehow it must be made to teach, according to their programme, that the law is abolished, though the apostle designed no such thing, as a few words will suffice to show. Under the figure of marriage, Paul represents the condition of a person before and after conversion. In the illustration are four things, the woman, the law, the first husband, and the second to whom she is at liberty to be married after the first husband is dead. In the case illustrated there are also four things: the sinner represented by the woman, the moral law, represented by the law of marriage, something to which the sinner is bound, represented by the first husband, and Christ, represented by the second husband. In the illustration the husband dies, and then the woman is free to marry another. In the case of the sinner, that also which is represented by the first husband dies, and that alone. Now, it will be seen, the whole question is, What constitutes the first husband? Do you say it is the law? Then you violate Paul's illustration; for in that he makes the husband distinct from the law, and it is the husband, not the law,

that dies. And again, if you say it is the law that has died, then you make the law the first husband, and represent Paul as teaching the following pitiful absurdity: The sinner is bound by the law to the law as long as the law lives; but when the law is dead, and there is nothing to show or condemn his sin, then he is ready, all reeking with moral pollution, to be received to the bosom of his Savior!

"Again we recur to the question on which the whole controversy of Romans 7 turns, namely: What constitutes the first husband? We have seen what unpardonable confusion it introduces into Paul's figures to call it the law. What then shall we call it? *Answer.*—That which dies when the sinner is converted. And what is that? It is what St. Paul so often speaks of as the 'old man,' the 'body of sin,' the 'carnal mind.' And this is always represented as being 'crucified,' 'destroyed,' and 'put off,' when the new man is put on. The sixth of Romans is introductory to the seventh. The reader is requested to examine it in this connection. Paul there gives us a discourse on conversion and baptism. He represents the sinner as slain by the law, or dead to sin, the old man crucified, and the body of sin destroyed: then he is ready to be buried with Christ by baptism, and rise to walk in newness of life. See the following Scriptures, where the putting off of the old man, and the putting on of the new, or the release from the first husband and the union with the second is described. (Eph. 4: 22–24: Col. 3: 9, 10; Rom. 6: 6.) Then to illustrate his subject, Paul introduces the figure used in ch. 7, a woman bound by the law to her husband, and not being allowed to marry another till her first husband was dead. Now, mark the conclusion to which he comes through this illustration: Is it that the law is dead? No; but 'wherefore, my brethren, *ye*, also, are become *dead* to the law by the body of Christ.' (v. 4.)

"'But,' says the objector, 'do we not read in v. 6, "But now we are delivered from the law, *that* being dead wherein we were held?" and

does not the word, that, refer to the law, and show that the law is dead?' By no means. The expression, that being dead, does not refer to the law. Turning to the Greek Testament, we find the word from which that expression comes, to be *apothneesko*. Did this word refer to the law, it should be in the genitive singular, the word law, just before it, being in that case and number; but it is in the nominative plural, and therefore refers to the word we: *we* are delivered from the law, *we* being dead to that, &c. The margin of our English version has the same reading, which is a literal rendering of the Greek. But even if we take it as it stands in the text, our opponents cannot make out of it what they claim; for the expression is qualified by the words, 'wherein we were held.' Wherein we were held while in sin? Not in the law, surely; but in a state of condemnation, or inseparably united to our old man of sin. This must die before we can be free from it. And the expressions, that being dead, or we being dead to that, are synonymous expressions; but the Greek forever settles the question that it cannot refer to the law. Therefore, look at it in whatever light we will, Romans 7 contains no intimation whatever that the law is in any degree relaxed, or we in any wise released from its claims. Rightly understood, there is a beautiful harmony in the illustration that Paul here uses, and the seventh of Romans becomes a strong citadel not for those who would have the law abolished, but for those who 'delight in the law of God after the inward man,' and who esteem the 'commandment holy, and just, and good.'"

We most fervently pray that we may be kept from expending any "amount of unnatural effort" in trying "to arrest and pervert" the language of the apostle. "Honesty is the best policy" in everything; and especially in treating upon the Scriptures, we should be honest, so that we can say from the heart, with the apostle (2 Cor. 4: 2): We have "renounced

the hidden things of dishonesty; not walking in craftiness, nor handling the Word of God deceitfully: but, by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God."

In order to make the more important points, in the foregoing extract, appear in their true light, we will prepare a few questions based upon the foregoing, and find the answers to them *in the precise language* of *Both Sides*, as quoted above.

1. What does Paul represent under this figure of marriage?

Ans.—"The condition of a person before and after conversion."

2. How many things does the apostle refer to in this illustration?

Ans.—"Four. The woman, the law, the first husband, and the second husband."

3. In the case illustrated, how many things are there?

Ans.—"Four." (1) "The sinner represented by the woman; (2) the moral law, represented by the law of marriage; (3) something [?] to which the sinner is bound; (4) and Christ represented by the second husband."

4. When the first husband dies, what can the woman do?

Ans.—"She is free to marry another."

5. What "alone" dies?

Ans.—"In the case of the sinner, that also which is represented by the first husband."

6. But in answer to our third question, did you not say that, "the sinner" is "represented by the *woman?*" and now in answer to the fifth, why do you say "the sinner" is "represented by the *first husband?*"

Ans.— ——

7. Which of these two questions embody the truth? or neither?

Ans.— ——!

8. What are we to understand the whole question to be?

Ans.—"The whole question is, What constitutes the first husband."

9. Well, then, please tell us plainly what does constitute the first husband?

Ans.—"That which dies when the sinner is converted!"

10. But how will you reconcile this with your answers to the third and fifth questions? In the third it was *"the woman!"* and in the fifth it was the *first husband!* and *now* you say it is *"that which dies when the sinner is converted!"* Which of these are true, or neither?

Ans.— ——!!

11. Do you not, on a little reflection, think it a "pitiful absurdity," to insinuate that a Christian brother could teach the idea that a sinner, "all reek-

ing with moral pollution," could be received to the bosom of his Savior?"

Ans.— ——!

12. What shall we call the conversion of the sinner?

Ans.—"The release from the first husband, and the union with the second."

13. Now, if the sinner is released from the first husband, does it not show (to carry out your own figure) that the *sinner* is represented by the *woman*, as you said in your answer to the third question, as it is the *woman* which was "bound" by the law to her "husband?" Are "*the woman*" and the "*first husband*" synonymous terms?

Ans.— ——!!

14. What is the "conclusion to which" the apostle "comes through his illustration?"

Ans.—"Wherefore, my brethren, *ye* also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ."

15. But how is this? If "*the brethren*" become "DEAD *to the law*," what has this "illustration" to do with the conversion of the sinner?

Ans.— ——!

16. And as you say in your answer to the third question, that "*the moral law*" is "represented by the law of marriage," does not the apostle say in his figure that the law of marriage was at an end, when the husband was *dead?* And does not this prove that *your* "moral law" is dead also!

Ans.— ——!

17. Does not the word "*that,*" which is found in v. 6, where it reads, "*that* being dead wherein we were held," refer to the law?

Ans.—"By no means. The expression, 'that being dead,' does not refer to the law."

18. But do not the expressions, "that being dead," or "we being dead to that," mean the same thing?

Ans.—"The expressions "*that being dead,*" or "*we being dead to that,* are synonymous terms."

19. Well, then, what is your conclusion now?

Ans.— ——!

20. Is there a "*beautiful harmony* [?] *in the illustration*" you have given?

Ans.— ——!

21. Does the seventh of Romans become "a strong citadel" *for* those who believe in the seventh-day Sabbath?

Ans.— ——!

22. Have we not proved by our questions and your answers, *that a great "amount of unnatural effort has been expended to wrest and pervert the language of the apostle?"*

Ans.— ——!

"At this point we cannot forbear introducing the following extract from Tappan's late standard work on logic, p. 385:

"'It is therefore always an important inquiry, whether the principles with which we begin are sufficiently established to be

made the premises of an argument. A judicious and honest reasoner will be cautious in this respect; but it is the nature of sophistry boldly to assume, and to supply by a show of confidence, the want of a true and adequate basis.'

"'Sometimes men are shamed into admitting an unfounded assertion, by being confidently told that it is so evident that it would argue great weakness to doubt it.'"

On pp. 175 and 219 of *Both Sides* it is said:

"If this writing upon the heart was left to men to do, what a scrawl we should have! What blurs, blots, scratches, and contradictions! * * * Such are a few of the crooks and contradictions which attach to any theory devised to overthrow the Sabbath. They are inherent in the system, if it may be called a system, and no man, however able and sound in other respects, who undertakes to defend such views can run clear of them."

Thank *Both Sides* for this, in regard to "crooks and contradictions."

THE SEVENTH OF ROMANS.

Is Romans 7 contradictory in itself? or is the apparent contradiction owing to inattention of the reader? We believe the latter; and by the Lord's help the truth will be made clearly to shine forth on this long-controverted subject. Several things need first be considered, before commencing a direct exposition of this chapter. Let us notice some points which the apostle had previously brought out and established in the third chapter. We shall follow the *Emphatic Diaglott*, with a few words of our own occasionally,

by way of paraphrase, which we hope will throw light on our common English version; as we may occasionally compare the two translations together. In the commencement of the third chapter, the apostle makes the inquiry: "What then is the SUPERIORITY of the JEW, or what the PROFIT of the CIRCUMCISION? Much in every respect; but first, indeed, because they were intrusted with the ORACLES of GOD." Now by passing to v. 9 the apostle inquires, "What then? Do we [as Jews] excel [above the Greek]? Not at all: for we before convicted both Jews and Greeks to be all under sin." Now v. 19: "But we [as Christians] know that whatever thing the LAW [*nomos*] says, it speaks to THOSE under the LAW [and to no one else]; so that every mouth may be stopped, and that all the WORLD may become amenable to God. Therefore by works of law no human being shall be justified in his presence; for through law there is an acknowledgment of sin. But now, apart from law, God's righteousness is made manifest, being attested [having been proved] by the LAW and the PROPHETS; even God's righteousness, through the faith of Christ, to ALL WHO BELIEVE; for there *is* no distinction, for all *have* sinned, and come short of the GLORY of GOD; being justified freely by HIS FAVOR, through THAT REDEMPTION which is by Christ Jesus;" or the FAITH OF JESUS. (v. 26.) "Where then is BOASTING? It is shut out. Through what law? of

works? No; but by the law of faith [Yes, 'THE LAW OF FAITH']; for we reckon that man is justified by faith, apart from works of law. Or is he the God of the Jews alone? and not of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also; since it is the one God who will justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through the faith [Yes, THE FAITH]. Do we then nullify law through THE FAITH? By no means; but we establish law."

Now we are ready to pass to the seventh chapter, and there we shall find what law is established. But to make the former part of the chapter easy to be understood, we will notice the *two kinds of law* of which the apostle is treating, by examining the last verses of the seventh, and the first of the eighth chapters. In v. 22 he says: "For I am pleased with the law of God according to the INWARD man; but I perceive another law [Yes, *another*] in my MEMBERS, warring against the law of my MIND, and making me a captive to THAT LAW OF SIN EXISTING in my MEMBERS. Wretched man that I am! who will rescue me from this BODY of DEATH? Thanks to God by means of Jesus Christ our Lord. Consequently, then, indeed, I myself, by the MIND, am in subjection to the law of God, but by the FLESH, to the law of sin."

Now, for the apostle's conclusion, as expressed in the first verses of the eighth chapter: "There is, then, no condemnation now to THOSE in the An-

ointed Jesus, for the LAW of the SPIRIT of LIFE [here is a NEW LAW] by the Anointed Jesus liberated me from the LAW of SIN and of DEATH. For what was IMPOSSIBLE for the LAW [the OLD LAW] in that it was weak through the flesh, God, having sent his own Son in a form of the flesh of sin, even [by an offering] for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: so that the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled by US, who are walking not according to flesh, but according to Spirit."

Was the apostle Paul in a state of imperfection, and sometimes under condemnation, or in a state of complete righteousness and justification as described in ch. 7? *Answer.*—He describes himself in both conditions. When Paul was nothing but a sinner, he was under the influence of but *one law*—"the law of sin." But when he is a Christian, he is under, or influenced by, *two* laws: "the law of sin," which still remained in his "FLESH;" and "the law of God," which he had in his "MIND." Therefore he says, as found in our common version (ch. 7: 22–25):

"For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God; through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin."

Now to prove that Paul is describing himself

while under sin—and also while under grace—we shall call attention to a paraphrase of particular portions of this chapter, that the reader may see by the tenses, *past* and *present*, that the apostle is speaking of himself as *before* and *after* conversion. This will help us out of all our difficulties about the *seventh of Romans.*

In order that the reader may have the benefit of different translations of this disputed passage in v. 6, we will give the following. Taken literally from the Greek, with a word-for-word translation, this oft-perverted Scripture would stand thus:

"Now but we have been freed from the law, having died in which we were held."

Here, then, at a glance, we have the whole argument fairly before us. To further show how critics generally render this passage, we will place before the reader a number of translations of this text, which come from persons who for their piety and knowledge of Biblical criticism are greatly entitled to our consideration.

"But NOW we are ABSOLVED FROM THE LAW, and *are dead to that* which held us in its grasp." (*Syriac.*)

"But now *we have been released by death* FROM THAT LAW, by which we were holden." (*Wakefield.*)

"But now we are *released* FROM THE LAW by which we were held, *having died.*" (*Sawyer.*)

"But now we are SEPARATED FROM THE LAW, *being dead to that* by which we were held." (*Whiting.*)

"But now *having died*, we are RELEASED FROM THE LAW."

"But now we are FREED FROM THE LAW, *being dead to that law* in which we were held bound." (*Bloomfield.*)

"But now we ARE DELIVERED FROM THE LAW, *having died to that wherein we were held.*" (*Am. Bib. Union.*)

"But now we have been discharged from the law, that being dead by which we were held fast." (*Haweis.*)

"But now we are loosed from the law, having died in that by which we were tied." (*Macknight.*)

"But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead by which we were bound." (*Worsley.*)

"But now we are delivered from the law, having died to that by which we were holden." (*Newcome.*)

"But we are now set free from the law by the death of that by which we were holden." (*Thompson.*)

"But now we are delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held." (*Sharpe.*)

"But now we are delivered from the law of death wherein we were held." (*Whiston.*)

"But now we are freed from the law, that whereby we were held being dead." (*Wesley.*)

"But now we, having died, are delivered from the law by which we were held in bondage." (*Boothroyd.*)

"But now we have been unbounden from the law of death, in which we were holden." (*Wicklif.*)

"But now we are delivered from the law, and dead from that whereunto we were in bondage." (*Tyndale.*)

"But now are we delivered from the law, and dead unto it whereunto we were in bondage." (*Cranmer.*)

"But now are we delivered from the law, and dead unto it, whereunto we were in bondage." (*Geneva.*)

"But now we are loosed from the law of death, wherein we were detained." (*Rheim's.*)

"But now we are delivered from the law, he being dead in whom we were holden." (*Beza.*)

"But now are we loosed from the law, and dead unto it that held us captive." (*Coverdale.*)

The following is the comment of Adam Clarke upon this passage:

"*But now we are delivered from the law*]. We who have believed in Christ Jesus, are delivered from that yoke by which we were bound, which sentenced every sinner to *perdition*, but provided no *pardon* even for the *penitent;* and no *sanctification* for those who are weary of their inbred corruptions. *That being dead wherein we were held*]. To us believers in Christ, this commandment is abrogated; we are transferred to another constitution; that law which kills, ceases to us; it is dead to us who have believed in Christ Jesus, who is the end of the law for justification and salvation to every one that believes."

Now for the remainder of the chapter, noticing the *past* and *present tenses*, and also keeping "the law of sin," and "the law of the mind," constantly before us to the close of the chapter. We begin with v. 7: "What then shall we say? Is the law sin? [which taught us we were sinners.] By no means. Indeed, I *did* not know sin except through law; for even strong desire I *had* not known, if the *law had* not said thou shalt not covet. [This is the tenth commandment, and thus it proves that the apostle is talking about the law of the Decalogue.] (8) But sin *having taken* opportunity, through the COMMANDMENT, *worked* in me all strong desire. Apart from law, however, sin is dead; (9) and I *was* formerly living apart from law; but the COMMANDMENT having come, sin *lived* again, and I *died;* (10) and that

commandment intended for life, the same *was found* by me for death. (11) For sin *having taken* opportunity, through the commandment *deceived* me, and through it killed me. (12) And so [for this purpose] the law indeed is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. (13) That good thing then has [it] become death to me? By no means, but SIN has; that sin might be manifest, through that good thing producing death to me; so that sin, through the commandment, might become an exceedingly great sinner. (14) Beside, we *know* that the law [of the mind] is spiritual; but I am fleshly, having been sold under sin. (15) For what I [according to the flesh] *work out* I do not approve; since I do not practice what I desire; but what I *hate* [according to the law of my mind] this I do. (16) But if what I desire not, this I do, I assent to the law [of God] that it is excellent: (17) and now, no longer I am working it out, but the sin dwelling in me [*i. e.*, in my flesh]. (18) For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, there dwells no good thing: for to desire is present with me, but to work out what is excellent, I find not. (19) For I do not the good which I desire, but the evil which I desire not [according to my mind] this I practice [according to the flesh]. (20) But if what I desire not, this I do, I no longer work it out, but the sin dwelling in me [*i. e.*, in my flesh]. (21) I find therefore this LAW, when I am willing to do right, that the wrong lies near me. (22) For I

am pleased with the LAW of God according to the inward man; (23) but I perceive another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and making me a captive to that law of sin existing in my members. (24) Wretched man that I am! who will rescue me from this [fleshly] body of death? (25) Thanks to God, by means of Jesus Christ our Lord. Consequently, then, indeed, I myself, by the mind, am in subjection to the law of God, but by the *flesh* to the law of sin."

So much for the seventh of Romans. Is it not plain?

AMUSING.

On p. 168 of *Both Sides* we find the following:

"But for what purpose could this imaginary objection, about the new covenant's not being now in force, have been raised, and then these ponderous quotations of Scripture introduced to rebut it? We call it an imaginary objection; for Eld. P. must have known that such was not our position; at least he had no excuse for not knowing it, for a few moment's examination of any of our publications touching that point, would have satisfied him that we held no such view."

To this I reply, if what is called "*our publications*" are all written in the same contradictory style as this "splendid" *Both Sides*, I think it would "puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer" to tell what Seventh-day Adventists do believe! On p. 169 is the following:

"Eld P. continues his argument to show that the new covenant is now in force. Had what he has written been relevant

to the question in hand, we had not had so much to say about its length and the tedious quotations from Scripture in connection with it. All scripture is good in its place; but one would not like to be compelled to read the first chapter of Chronicles in the midst of an argument for baptism, nor the thirty-eighth of Ezekiel on the doctrine of repentance."

True. This is quite sensible for *Both Sides*. But we will just say, If "the first chapter of Chronicles" does not furnish us with "an argument for baptism," "nor the thirty-eighth of Ezekiel" treat upon "the doctrine of repentance;" those portions of God's Word are *not contradictions* to those subjects!

PREBLE VS. PREBLE.

This "splendid book," *Both Sides*, would be incomplete if it did not contain some extracts from my old "tract written in 1845." Hence, on p. 90 the author of *Both Sides* says:

"And on this point we will let Preble of 1845 answer Preble of 1864. In his tract written in 1845 he says: 'And *John Calvin*, in his "Institution of the Christian Religion," p. 128, says, "The Old Fathers put in the place of the Sabbath the day we call Sunday." Mark this! *The Old Fathers did it!* Not the God of heaven! Whom will we obey? Thus we see Daniel 7: 25 fulfilled, the "little horn" changing "times and laws." Therefore it appears to me that all who keep the first day of the week for "*the Sabbath*," are *Pope's Sunday keepers! and* GOD'S SABBATH BREAKERS!'"

All I need say to this is, the reader will notice that I was following "*John Calvin*" instead of the

"LIVING JESUS" when I was led to pen the above extremely erroneous assertions. I hope the Lord has forgiven that error of my *head!* The following, in regard to "*John Calvin's*" views of the Sabbath, will show that "Preble of 1845" did not know as much as "Preble of 1864." A recent writer, who has gotten up a "history [?] of the Sabbath," in favor of the "seventh day," says on p. 317:

"Calvin regarded the festival called the Lord's day as nothing but a human ordinance, and it is upon record that himself and friends at Geneva 'debated whether the reformed, for the purpose of estranging themselves more completely from the Romish Church, should not adopt Thursday as the Christian Sabbath.' Another reason assigned by Calvin for this proposed change was, 'that it would be a proper instance of Christian liberty.'"

As an answer to the above, about changing the Lord's day to "Thursday," I take the following from Gilfillan, p. 415:

"The charge preferred by Barclay against Calvin, that 'he had a consultation once as to transferring the Lord's day observances to Thursday,' had nothing to support it but the word of a man who lived in the Court of James I., as a spy in the interest of the Queen-mother of France, and who, says Dr. Twisse, 'if he could not prove true and loyal to his natural prince, could not be expected to carry himself truly and honestly toward John Calvin.'"

But another thing stated above by this late historian (?) of the seventh-day Sabbath, must, I think, surprise the intelligent reader who is acquainted with

the history of the Reformation. Let us mark well what he says:

"Calvin regarded the festival called the Lord's day *as nothing* but a *human* ordinance!"

Now let Calvin speak, as we find in Gilfillan, pp. 408–11. Calvin says:

"It is for us to dedicate ourselves wholly to God, renouncing our feelings and all our affections; and then, since we have this external ordinance, to act as becomes us, to *lay aside our earthly affairs*, so that we may be entirely free to meditate on the works of God." (Ser. 34, Deut. 5.)

"The Sabbath is the bark of a spiritual substance, the use of which is still in force, of denying ourselves, of renouncing all our own thoughts and affections, and of *bidding farewell to one and all of our own employments*, so that God may reign in us, then of employing ourselves in the worship of God." (Ibid.)

"Every man ought to *withdraw himself from everything but the consideration of God and his works*, that all men may be stirred up to serve and honor him." (Ser. 93, Deut. 5.)

"If we employ the Lord's day to make good cheer, to sport ourselves, to go to games and pastimes, shall God in this be honored? Is it not a mockery? Is not this an unhallowing of his name?" (Ser. 34, Deut. 5.)

"Let us bear in mind, that this day is not appointed for us only to come to the sermon, but that we might employ the rest of the time in praising God; * * * in digesting the good doctrine, that by this means we may be so formed and fashioned as that during the week it may cost us nothing to raise our hearts to God." (Ibid.)

"I am obliged to be a little more prolix here, because in our day some unquiet spirits make an outcry about the LORD'S DAY. They complain that the Christian people are nursed in Judaism because some observance of days is retained." (Instit. On fourth commandment.)

"When our shop windows are shut on the LORD'S DAY—when *we travel not* after the common order and fashion of men—this is to the end we should have more liberty and leisure to attend on that which GOD COMMANDETH, that is, to be taught by his Word, to meet together, to make confession of our faith, to call upon his name, to exercise ourselves in the use of his sacraments —the purpose which this order ought to serve." (Ser. 34, Deut. 5.)

This may suffice, for the present, to show us that "*Calvin*" did regard the Lord's day as something more than a "human ordinance!" He says it is for the purpose that we may "attend on that which GOD COMMANDETH."

I would now ask, in view of the foregoing, if intelligent Christians must believe in such a "third" "message" as is going the rounds in these days, or be accused of having the "mark of the beast!"

What will the author of *Both Sides* now say in regard to "Preble of 1845" and "*John Calvin?*"

Again, on p. 130 is the following item from my old tract:

"It would be well if he had adhered to the sentiment he expressed in his tract written in 1845 in honor and vindication of the Sabbath, p. 12: 'But for one, I had rather obey God, and have his approbation here and finally enjoy the blessings of the new earth—though all men hate me—than to have the good opinion of men here, and perish at last. Or in other words, and in the language of another, "I had rather go to heaven *alone*, than to hell with the multitude."'"

I have only to say that, in this, I am of the same mind in "1864" as in "1845." May this mind be in

me and in my readers until the end. Again, on pp. 215–16 we find the following:

"What his basis was, will still further appear from a couple of extracts from the tract referred to, which the reader will be pleased to see in this connection. In a prefatory note to the reader he says:

"'A FEW QUESTIONS FOR THE READER TO ANSWER BEFORE READING THE FOLLOWING PAGES.—What authority have you in the Old or New Testament to keep any day as a Sabbath, or day of rest? Do you find any command in the New Testament? If not, why do you not observe the day that is appointed in the fourth commandment? Has the day ever been changed? If so, *when* and *where?* Please point to the chapter and verse.'

"Yes, we would like the chapter and verse. We will let the reader decide whether Preble of 1864 is able to answer the questions of Preble of 1845. Again he says, p. 7:

"'In relation to the practice of the apostles, there is but one meeting of the disciples on the first day of the week mentioned in the New Testament, and that is in Acts 20: 7. But there are many meetings recorded which they held on the Sabbath. I know 1 Corinthians 16: 2 is considered proof respecting the first day; but when examined, I think it proves the contrary. It says, "Upon the first *day* of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him," &c. The expression, "lay by him in store," I think plainly implies that they were at home, rather than at meeting. Revelation 1: 10 is the only other place that can be construed to favor the first day. John says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." Now who knows whether he meant the first or the seventh day? I think the latter, because it is called "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," but the first is nowhere called so! In regard to the Sabbath, Christ says, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Not *a* Sabbath, but *the* Sabbath. He says also,

"The Sabbath was made for man," and not man for the Sabbath. (Mark 2: 27, 28.) He does not say, *the* Sabbath was made for the Jews, and *a* Sabbath for the Gentiles, but "THE *Sabbath was made for man*"—all mankind.'

"It will be seen from the above that Eld. P. once occupied a position for which he could give a valid reason. He has exchanged it, alas! for one for which no just ground can be found, either in nature, reason, history, or revelation."

In relation to the foregoing extracts from my old tract—which lives very much longer as a monument of my past ignorance than I could wish—I confess that my *heart* in "1845" in regard to the Sabbath question was very much better than my *head!* I was a mere novice in this matter then! but I have made some improvement in my studies during the last *nineteen years*, and therefore can truly say that there is *some truth* in the above; but there is much which is truly mortifying to me. And I must submit to the reader whether I have given "a valid reason" in the preceding pages of this book for a change of position; and he must "decide whether Preble of 1864 is able to answer the questions of Preble of 1845."

Again, p. 224:

"We trust you still adhere to the noble sentiment expressed in your tract of 1845: 'Truth is what I am after; and if I had but one day on this earth to spend, I would give up error for truth as soon as I could see it.'"

This "noble sentiment" was what led me to *give up the seventh-day Sabbath.* And I hope, through

rich grace in Christ Jesus, that this sentiment may still govern me, and my readers, while this mortal life shall be continued to us; that we at last may enjoy an endless life, in a world free from all error and sin. *Amen.*

CONCLUSION OF SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT.

We now come to what the author of *Both Sides* says in closing his "reply" to my Scriptural argument, and commencing his "reply" to what we gave as evidence from history, and the Fathers, in favor of the first day of the week. On pp. 191–2 we find the following:

"We now leave the unerring record, the firm ground, of the Holy Scriptures, and take our way into a *region where the bogs and mire of error, corruption, and superstition* surround us on every side. Into this region the advocates of first-day sacredness almost invariably deem it necessary to go, for the support of their darling institution. With how much safety they can appeal to the records of a time when the inspired writers had all left the stage of action, may be determined from the fact that Paul declared that even in his day the mystery of iniquity already worked, and that *after* his departure grievous wolves should enter in, not sparing the flock, and that men of their *own selves* should arise, speaking *perverse things*, to draw away disciples after them. (2 Thess. 2: 7; Acts 20: 29, 30.) Without the most careful discrimination, those who appeal to this age, are liable to receive as honest Christians some of those 'grievous wolves,' and take as the genuine records of truth those 'perverse things,' against which Paul has warned us.

"Discerning writers have often cautioned us against the use

that is made of the pretended testimony of the Fathers. Says Bower, in his History of the Popes, vol. I., p. 1: 'To avoid being imposed upon, we ought to treat tradition as we do a notorious and known liar, to whom we give no credit, unless what he says is confirmed to us by some person of undoubted veracity. * * * False and lying traditions are of an early date, and the greatest men have, out of a pious credulity, suffered themselves to be imposed upon by them.'

"Dowling, in his History of Romanism, book 2, ch. 1, says: 'The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.' Nor is it of any account in the estimation of the genuine Protestant *how early* a doctrine originated, if it is not found in the Bible.

"Dr. Adam Clarke in his life, p. 134, uses the following strong language: 'We should take heed how we quote the Fathers in proof of the doctrines of the Gospel; because he who knows them best, knows that on many of these subjects they blow hot and cold.' In commenting upon Proverbs 8 he says: 'But of these we may safely state that there is not a truth in the most orthodox creed that cannot be proved by their authority: nor a *heresy* that has disgraced the Romish Church, that may not challenge them as its abettors. In point of *doctrine*, their authority is, with me, nothing. The Word of God alone contains my creed. On a number of points I can go to the Greek and Latin Fathers of the Church to know what *they believed*, and what the people of their respective communions believed; but after all this I must return to God's Word to know what he would have *me* to believe.' For a further statement concerning the authority of the Fathers, and how their writings have been corrupted by the Romish Church, the reader is referred to the *History of the Sabbath*, pp. 193–204.".

What a plunge here is—the first thing—into "*the bogs and mire* of error, corruption, and superstition!"

And let us bear this fact in mind, that all the evidence I gave, or ever referred to *outside* of the Bible, was only *ninety lines*, or about *two pages* as found in *Both Sides*. But our opponent took such a *plunge* into the "bogs and mire of error" that he quotes, and refers to evidence outside of the Bible, to the amount of about *thirty pages!* twenty-eight pages more than ours: or about *thirty* pages to our *two*. May we not, with justice, turn our opponent's language upon himself with a slight variation and say: "Into this region [of 'bogs and mire'] the advocates of *seventh*-day sacredness almost invariably deem it necessary to go, for the support of this darling institution!"

REVIEW OF J. N. ANDREWS' "HISTORY OF THE SABBATH."

As the author of *Both Sides*, in his reply to the historical evidence we presented, refers mostly to the *History of the Sabbath* by J. N. Andrews, we shall take leave of *Both Sides*, and commence a review of this history (?) to which *Both Sides* refers on p. 6 in the following manner:

"He [Preble] will need to send forth publications which can cope with such works as the *History of the Sabbath* by J. N. Andrews, which not only has not been answered, but remains to be even attacked. We would not however council him to any such effort."

The reader will notice that we attempt this work without the "counsel" of our opponent; but nevertheless, we venture! As the argument (?) of *Both Sides* on the Scriptural portion of the "reply" is mostly a mere "echo" of this history, I do not deem it necessary to spend my time on that part of the work: but commence where the historical part of the work is found. This will correspond with that part of the "reply" already referred to above, where

we have left that, for this. We will begin with this *History of the Sabbath* on p. 193, under "Part II.—Secular History." In the early part of my labors in this review, I intended to go into a very general reply to "Part II." of J. N. Andrews' work; and thus prepared some three hundred pages of matter in this department. But the more I examined the work, the less confidence I had in it; and therefore came to the conclusion, that a lengthy review was unworthy the attention of the reader. If I prove it to be emphatically an *ex parte* thing, it will be all that duty requires, or justice demands. The first thing to be noticed is, the ponderous array of names of the authors quoted by "J. N. A." as *his witnesses* (?) in favor of the seventh-day Sabbath. The following is a catalogue of their names:

Gibbon, Dowling, Robinson, Neander, Bower, Dr. Cumming, Dr. Adam Clarke, Wm. Reeves, "A Roman Catholic" (name not given), Mosheim, Prof. Stuart, Dr. Killen, Prof. Hackett, Milner, Kitto, Eusebius, Sir Wm. Domville, Lyman Coleman, Pliny, Charles Buck, N. B. Taylor, John Calvin, Prof. C. F. Hudson, Morer, Gurney, Worcester, the *North British Review*, Verstegan, Jennings, Chasie, Dr. Heylyn, Justin Martyr, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "Victor, Bishop of Rome," Constantine, Tertullian, Milman, Wm. James, Dr. Hase, Lord King, Giesler, Dr. Francis White, Lord Bishop, Joseph Bingham, Mr. Cox, Edward Brerewood, "A recent English writer," Prynne, John Ley, Jartin, Baxter, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, Emperor Leo, Socrates, Lardner, Sozoman, Hengstenburg, Francis West, Pope Gregory, Fleury, Mahomet (?), "Irenæus Philalethes," Charlemagne, Pope Gregory VII., Matthew Paris, Wilkins,

Sir David Dalrymple, Roger Hoveden, Binius, Benedict, Dean Waddington, Saccho, "Theodore Belvidre, a popish monk," Dr. Edgar, Dr. Peter Allix, "An old Romish writer," Mr. Crosby, Mr. James, the *Jewish Gretzer*, "The respectable French historian, De Thou," "A Roman Catholic author," "Another Romish author," Michael Geddes, Stebbing, J. W. Massie, Mr. Yeates, "Francis Xavier, a famous Romish saint," "Augsburg Confession," Zwingle, Beza, Bucer, Cranmer, Tyndale, Luther, Carlstadt, D'Aubigne, Dr. Schoeur, Francis Davidis, Mr. Maxon, Ross, Mr. Utter, M. de la Roque, Nicholas Bound, Cotton Mather, John Sprint, John Thraske, Theophilus Brabaurn, Philip Tandy, Francis Bamfield, Mr. Noel, Wood, Thomas Banfield, Edward Stennett, Isaac Backus, John W. Morton, *Thomas Preble* (?), Joseph Bates, Eld. James White, and Dr. Peter Akers!

What an array of names! We think it would puzzle anybody, even "Sir Wm. Domville," to tell what some of these authors could possibly have to do with establishing the *sanctity of the seventh-day Sabbath!* But let us look at this matter in another light.

The number of authors above given amount to about *one hundred and twenty* in all; besides some twenty "councils" and "synods" which are called in as evidence of the sanctity of the seventh-day Sabbath. This number of authors and documents, thus referred to in this wonderful history, amount to almost *four times* the number of all the writers of the Old and New Testaments! And what makes this still more marvelous, is the fact that the quotations from this numerous class of authors and documents

are so meager, being culled and picked—or in plain English—*garbled*, that they are all found on less than one hundred and fifty pages of this small work of J. N. Andrews! And when we take out the *comments* of the writer of this famous production, we shall find but about sixty-six pages of matter thus quoted from the huge mass of publications from which he professed to have culled it—say a cart-load of books!

But says the objector, "I should think when we find so many authors all on the side of the seventh-day Sabbath, it ought to convince any honest mind that the seventh day is the true Sabbath!" Well, it would so appear if it was only true! and we will look at this a moment! But let us first turn to the "preface" of this history, on the fourth page, and see what the writer says there in regard to the great number of writers which he has called to his aid:

> "The only seventh-day historians quoted in this work are Mr. Maxon and Mr. Utter; and these are quoted near the conclusion of the work, and on matters that are not in dispute."

Mark this! ONLY TWO out of about one hundred and twenty that were on the side of the seventh day! And yet, J. N. A. so *culls* and *picks*, and then *comments* upon what he has thus taken from some one hundred and eighteen authors (who, as he confesses, were believers in the "first-day") as to make his readers believe that their testimony goes to favor the sanctity of the seventh day! And then, really has

the boldness to say, in the quotations made from his "preface," that "the reader has therefore the best possible guaranty that the testimonies quoted in this work were not written in the interest of the Bible Sabbath."

What will the reader say to such a "guaranty" (?) as this!

"BOGS AND MIRE OF ERROR."

Let us for a few moments notice what a "plunge" this historian made into the "bogs and mire of error!" The book under review contains 340 pages. What the author calls "Part I.—Bible History" contains 192 pages; and "Part II.—Secular History" contains 148 pages. So, we perceive, he spends about as much time in the so-called "bogs and mire of error" as he does in "the unerring record" of the sacred Scriptures." Hence, we see that the remark made by *Both Sides*, in regard to first-day believers, is really true of themselves: "Into a region where the bogs and mire of error, corruption, and superstition surround us on every side, the "advocates of" the seventh-day "sacredness almost invariably deem it necessary to go, for the support of their darling institution."

EARLY APOSTASY IN THE CHURCH.

The first ten pages of "Secular History—Part II." are devoted to the early apostasy of the Church;

and his reasoning appears to have about as much bearing on the Sabbath question as it would to argue that *all money* should be cast away as worthless, because there is some counterfeit. On p. 204 is found the following important admission: "The first day of the week is now almost universally observed as the Christian Sabbath." Thank J. N. A. for this. On the same page he speaks of "two eminent Church historians"—Mosheim and Neander—and then says: "But so directly do they *contradict each other*, that it is a question of curious interest to determine which of them states the truth!" Pretty grave charge against his "two eminent Church historians!" How does J. N. Andrews go to work to make out his case, that there is a "contradiction" between the "two eminent Church historians!" He first quotes Mosheim as follows:

"All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week on which the triumphant Savior arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the Church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the express appointment of the apostles, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout all the Christian Churches, as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers."

Then he quotes Neander as saying:

"The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far

from them, and from the early apostolic Church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered laboring on Sunday as a sin."

J. N. A. then says, "How shall we determine which of these historians is in the right?" He says "neither of them lived in the apostolic age of the Church." And I say, Neither did J. N. Andrews live in the apostolic age of the Church. But the question now arises, In which of the above authors, Mosheim or Neander, shall we place the most confidence? In Torry's preface to his first volume of Neander he says:

"The translator deems it proper to state, that his labors on Neander began and were prosecuted to the completion of several successive volumes, or parts of the present work, many years ago. * * * He has certainly no reason to regret, but rather much reason to congratulate himself, that his first translation did not find its way to the press. In 1843 Dr. Neander sent forth a second edition of the first volume of his work, embracing the history of the Church, in the first three centuries. In this new edition, the alterations are numerous and important. * * * These important changes occurring not here and there, but through entire paragraphs, have made it necessary to translate *nearly the whole of the first volume anew*. The translator has submitted to this labor with the more cheerfulness, as it enables him to present the work to the English reader in the form in which Dr. Neander has been pleased to express his wish that it should appear."

Now, I ask, Was Mosheim ever under the necessity of making such alterations in his history?

But again, Who was *Neander?* He was born in 1789. "His parents professed the JEWISH RELIGION." "In 1805 he became a convert to the Christian faith." (Blake's Bio. Dict.) Is it any wonder, then, that he was compelled to make alterations in his history, when he became more acquainted with the "*Christian faith?*" When the reader shall find the above extracts, taken by J. N. Andrews from Neander's *new* and *revised edition* of his work, we hope he will point it out to us. But not to complain of Neander, do we find him to "contradict" Mosheim as J. N. Andrews boldly asserts? To have the point at issue fairly understood, let J. N. A. state it himself as in the following:

"The questions to be decided by this testimony are these: Did the apostles set apart Sunday for divine worship? (as Mosheim affirms,) or does the evidence in the case show that the festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance? (as is affirmed by Neander.)" (p. 205.)

But what is the meaning of the phrase—"the festival of Sunday?" Neander gives us his view of it in this language, saying it was "like all other festivals." Does this phrase, "all other festivals," mean all other *Christian* festivals, or *Roman Catholic* festivals? This will be made plain hereafter. And what does Neander say to this? "It was far from the intention of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect." Mark it—"in THIS respect." And again he says, it was far "from the early apostolic

Church to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday." Who does not know, and agree with this? Who believes that the old laws of the seventh-day Sabbath were ever *transferred to Sunday!* Only think of it! The old laws of the seventh-day Sabbath! Must not do "*any work!*" must not build *any fire!* if they did they must be *stoned to death!* Who, we ask again, believes that "the early apostolic Church" ever transferred the "laws of the Sabbath to Sunday!" Does this "*contradict*" Mosheim? Does Neander *deny* that "all Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week * * * for the solemn celebration of public worship?" Does Neander *deny* that "this pious custom, which was derived from the example of the Church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the appointment of the apostles, * * * and was observed universally throughout all the Christian Churches, as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers?" In this light, what must we think of J. N. A. as a historian?

AN ATTEMPT TO IMPEACH THE FATHERS.

The next effort of J. N. A. is to impeach the testimony of the early Fathers and others. He devotes some seventeen pages of his history, from p. 206 to p. 223, to this unworthy object! Why should any Christian man resort to the same style of argument

for the overthrow of the Fathers, that infidels and sceptics do, in order to overthrow the authenticity of the Scriptures! They must be hard pushed to do this. After bringing forward to the stand about a dozen witnesses to impeach the testimony of St. Barnabas, J. N. A. then says (p. 209):

"Thus first-day historians being allowed to decide the case, we are authorized to treat this epistle as a forgery."

Next he takes up Pliny's testimony in favor of the first day; and after bringing to his aid several witnesses, he says (p. 211):

"It must be conceded that this testimony of Pliny proves nothing in support of Sunday observance."

Next he attacks the testimony of Ignatius. As an introduction to this, he makes the following bold assertion (p. 212):

"Two important facts relative to this quotation are worthy of particular notice: 1. That the epistles of Ignatius are acknowledged to be spurious by first-day writers of high authority; and those epistles which some of them accept as possibly genuine, do not include in their number the epistle to the Magnesians from which the above quotation is made, nor do they say anything relative to first-day observance. 2. That the epistle to the Magnesians would say nothing of any day, were it not that the word day had been fraudulently inserted by the translator."

To bear him out in this, J. N. A. here brings forward some half dozen witnesses, and then concludes the whole in the following most surprising language (p. 216):

"The evidence is now before the reader which must determine whether Mosheim or Neander spoke in accordance with the facts in the case. And thus it appears that in the New Testament and in the uninspired writers of the period referred to, there is absolutely nothing to sustain the strong Sunday statement of Mosheim. Of the epistles ascribed to Barnabas, Pliny, and Ignatius, we have found that the first is a forgery; that the second speaks of a stated day without defining what one; and that the third, which is probably a spurious document, would say nothing of any day, if the advocates of Sunday had not interpolated the word *day* into the document! We can hardly avoid the conclusion that Mosheim spoke on this subject *as a doctor of divinity*, and not as a historian; and with the firmest conviction that we speak the truth, we say with Neander, 'The festival of Sunday was always only a human ordinance.'"

Now let us put J. N. A. upon the stand, and let him pass the ordeal of a cross-examination. We now inquire, (1) Mr. A., did you not say on p. 204, in speaking of Neander and Mosheim as "eminent Church historians," that "so directly do they contradict each other, that it is a question of curious interest to determine which of them states the truth?"

Ans.—I did.

2. Have you not also stated on p. 216, that you "can hardly avoid the conclusion that Mosheim spoke on this subject as a doctor of divinity, and not as a historian?'

Ans.—I have.

3. Do you intend by this to give us to understand that you cannot believe the "doctor of divinity" can speak the "truth!"

Ans.— ——!

4. After you have thus impeached *Mosheim* as a witness, why do you bring *him* upon the stand again, for the purpose of impeaching the testimony of "Barnabas," as found on p. 207?

Ans.— ——!

5. And why do you place confidence in Mosheim as an "*eminent Church historian,*" if he, when inclined to "contradict" the "truth," will just step aside from his "eminent" position as a "historian," and thus cover up his iniquity under the garb of a "*divine!*"

Ans.— ——!

6. On reflection, do you think you are justified in saying as you do on p. 216, that "there is absolutely nothing to sustain the strong Sunday statement of Mosheim!"

Ans.—I do!

7. How can you make such a bold assertion, and thus "contradict" the testimony of Justin Martyr, as found in Wm. Reeves' *Apologies* (vol. I., pp. 18, 19), which reads as follows:

"Thus again it is said (Acts 20: 7), that upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them. Now these words seem fairly to intimate, that the first day of the week or the LORD'S DAY, was set apart, or *sanctified*, for religious worship, but then finding Justin Martyr, who wrote but forty years after the death of St. John, telling us in the following apology, that on Sunday all the Christians, in city or country, meet together because that is

the day of our Lord's resurrection, and then we have read unto us the writings of the prophets and apostles; this done the President or Bishop makes a sermon to the assembly, to exhort them to imitate and do the things they heard; then we all join in prayer, and after that we receive the sacrament, and they that are willing and able give alms. Now, finding this, related by Justin and the Fathers in general, it clears up the foregoing text beyond dispute for the religious observation of the Lord's day in the time of the apostles?"

Ans.— ——!

8. Do you still say that the epistle of Barnabas is a "forgery?"

Ans.—I do.

9. Have you not overlooked the fact that it is not the "*epistle*" as such, but the *author* of it, about which the doubt arises?

Ans.—I think not.

We will introduce the following testimony. For our first witness against you, we will take your own "eminent Church historian," *Neander*, as he ought to be a competent witness with you. On p. 66, vol. I., by Torry, he says:

"The epistle ascribed to Barnabas contains examples of such points of translation, through which men of Alexandrian culture might be led over to Christianity."

Again, on p. 295 it is said:

"Thus in the Catholic epistle ascribed to Barnabas, at the close of the 15th chapter, Sunday is designated as the day of jubilee in remembrance of Christ's resurrection."

Also on p. 650 he says:

"As the idea was held by many, it contained nothing in it which was unchristian. They framed to themselves a spiritual idea of the happiness of this period, perfectly corresponding with the essence of the Gospel, conceiving under it nothing else than the universal dominion of the divine will, the undisturbed and blissful reunion of the whole community of the saints, and the restoration of harmony between a sanctified humanity and all nature transfigured into its primitive innocence." (So Barnabas, ch. 15.)

We will now introduce another of your witnesses —"Mr. W. B. Taylor, an able anti-Sabbatarian writer." He says on p. 37 of *Obligation of the Sabbath:*

"We find this idea of a millennial Sabbath very common among the Christian Fathers. In an epistle of UNDOUBTED ANTIQUITY (though generally considered as falsely ascribed to Barnabas, the companion of Paul,) the meaning of the six days' creation is said to be, 'that in six thousand years the Lord will bring all things to an end,' and 'that when his Son shall come and abolish the season of the wicked one—then he shall gloriously rest in that seventh day." (Wakeman's Trans., ch. 13.)

One more of your witnesses we will bring to the stand: "Justin Martyr, A. D. 140," and see what he will say about the epistle of Barnabas. On p. 46 of his "Dialogue with Trypho," it is said in a note:

"And they are likewise applied by St. Barnabas, in the eleventh chapter of his epistle, to those baptisms which the Jews instituted to themselves."

Again, on p. 56 in a note:

"St. Barnabas, in the tenth section of his epistle, has, according to the received opinion of the rabbies, given the following account concerning the abstaining from certain meats."

Also, on p. 95 in a note:

"To the same purpose speaks St. Barnabas, sec. 7."

Again, on p. 97:

"Agreeable to this is what St. Barnabas says to the Jews, sec. 15: 'The Sabbaths which ye now keep are not acceptable unto me, but those which I have made; when resting from all things I shall begin the eighth day; that is the beginning of the other world. For which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus both rose from the dead, and manifested himself to his disciples: and so ascended into heaven.'"

Now for your "able" witness, Sir Wm. Domville. Let him speak (on p. 293 of his work entitled *The Sabbath*):

"The epistle ascribed to Barnabas, the writer of which says (and he probably says only what was believed by all Christian Churches in his day, whenever that might be), 'These things therefore [Sabbaths, new moons, &c.] hath God abolished, that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is without the yoke of any such necessity, might have the spiritual offering of men themselves.'"

What shall we say to such testimony as this? Did these "eminent" historians, like Mosheim, as J. N. A. would have us believe, lay aside their dignity as "historians," and then speak "as a doctor of divinity" in order to "contradict" the truth? We will now close in favor of Barnabas, with the following from the introduction to "the general epistle of Barnabas" as found in the Apoc. New Testament, from

the last London edition, published in Boston, 1860. It speaks thus:

"Barnabas was a companion and fellow-preacher with Paul. This epistle lays a greater claim to canonical authority than most others. It has been cited by Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, and many ancient Fathers. Cotelerius affirms that Origen and Jerome esteemed it genuine and canonical; but Cotelerius himself did not believe it to be either one or the other; on the contrary, he supposes it was written for the benefit of the Ebionites (the Christianized Jews) who were tenacious of rites and ceremonies. Bishop Fell feared to own expressly what he seemed to be persuaded of, that it ought to be treated with the same respect as several of the books of the present canon. Dr. Bernard Savilian, professor at Oxford, not only believed it to be genuine, but that it was read throughout, in the Churches at Alexandria, as the canonical Scriptures were. Dodwell supposed it to have been published before the epistle of Jude and the writings of both the Johns. Vossius, Dupuis, Dr. Cave, Dr. Mill, Dr. S. Clarke, Whiston, and Archbishop Wake also esteemed it genuine: Menardus, Archbishop Laude, Spanheim, and others deemed it apocryphal."

ATTEMPT TO IMPEACH IGNATIUS' TESTIMONY.

J. N. A. says on p. 212:

"The epistles of Ignatius are acknowledged to be spurious by first-day writers of high authority."

Again, on p. 213 he quotes Domville as follows:

"'Every one at all conversant with such matters is aware that the works of Ignatius have been more interpolated and corrupted than those of any other of the ancient Fathers: and also

that some writings have been attributed to him which are wholly spurious.'"

In connection with this, we choose to quote Domville a little more fully, and then the reader will know better how to judge the merits of the case. On p. 237–8 of his work entitled *The Sabbath,* published in London, 1849, he says:

"Every one at all conversant with such matters is aware that the works of Ignatius have been more interpolated and corrupted than those of any other of the ancient Fathers; and also, that some writings have been attributed to him which are wholly spurious. 'Archbishop Usher was the first that began to remedy the confusion in the works of Ignatius, and to restore him to his primitive simplicity in his edition of them at Oxford, A. D. 1644; but this edition consisted only of the old Latin translation of them.' Some years afterwards Cotelerius [Cotelier], an eminent French divine, in a collection which he published of the works of the apostolic Fathers, inserted all the works that had ever been attributed to Ignatius with a new Latin translation of them. Some idea may be formed of the extent to which liberties had been taken with the name and writings of this father, when it is found that Cotelerius ranges his subject under these four heads:

"1. Sancti Ignatii Epistolæ. (The epistles of St. Ignatius. These are seven in number, and very short.)

"2. Sancti Ignatii Epistolæ Interpolatæ. (These are the seven short epistles, largely interlopated.)

"3. Epistolæ Supposititiæ. (Spurious epistles.)

"4. Aliæ Adulterinæ Epistolæ. (Other spurious epistles.)

"Cotelerius also gives, in his edition, the old Latin translation, which he entitles 'Epistolarum vararum et supposititiarum vetus versio.'"

The reason why J. N. A. would pass such testi-

mony as this, is doubtless because Domville says Cotelerius was an "eminent French *divine!*" It will be remembered that he has great aversion to "doctors of divinity!" As a rebuke for those who complain of the "Fathers," we will take the following from the preface of Reeves' *Apology* (vol. I., pp. 35, 36):

"The design of criticism at first was to rescue injured authors from the depredations of time and moths, or much worse vermin, to enlighten and beautify their sense, and restore them to their original perfection. But now it is the art of finding fault only, or rather of making wounds for the reputation of a cure, and vending wit at the price of honesty. And finding fault being what we are naturally disposed to, and correction an art of authority which we all admire; critics have multiplied in great quantities from this corruption. Happy the man who can but discover a spot in the sun, or in some celebrated writer; how noble the discovery and the seeming blemish to be illustrated above all his other indisputable beauties."

"The case of spurious books, and spurious children, I take to be much the same; and should I argue thus, that those children which go under the names of their reputed fathers, are not all truly such, but a great part of them bastards, so that there is no knowing which are theirs, and which not: I hope our Fathers would cry out shame on the argument, or else it would make mad work in the world; and yet the argument holds equally good both ways, against the legitimacy of children, as well as the genuineness of books; that is, the argument is good for nothing, for the spuriousness of some ought not to affect the genuineness of others; and there is no manner of consequence, that because some false pieces have been fathered upon Justin Martyr and Tertullian, therefore these apologies, which were

never questioned, ought to lie under the same imputation. So that before we take upon us to bastardize, we must give particular reasons for so doing: and he who will not believe a book or a child to be the lawful issue of that man whose name it bears, when he has no reason to suspect the contrary, ought to believe nothing upon less grounds than demonstration, and never to eat or drink till he can demonstrate the goodness of the food; and however this way of reasoning may suit with his head, I dare say it will not agree very long with his stomach.

"2. If the spuriousness of some pieces may attaint the rest, why do the objectors make use of the Fathers occasionally, when they fancy it may serve their turn? Why do they admit the Canon of Scripture upon the authority of the Fathers? for to admit their testimony in one case, and to reject it in another equally clear and universal, is to play fast and loose, and act upon no principles at all.

"3. Supposing a book, not to be that author's whose name it bears, or to be anonymous, yet it was manifestly written in the first ages of the Church, and quoted and approved by the Catholic writers of that, or the following, centuries, I see no ground to object against it, unless we will affirm a good book, without the author's name, to be good for nothing.

"4. There is an end of all historical evidence, of all law, friendship, and commerce in the world, if the suppositiousness of some writings, the forgery of some deeds, the falsehood of some friends, the adulterating of some coin, must affect all the rest. Nay, there is an end of all Gospel, for many spurious pieces have passed under the name of the apostles. But now if there be no rules to distinguish what is apostolic from what is not, why do we receive the New Testament? If there be, I ask, why these rules will not serve in case of the Fathers, as well as the apostles? For to say that Providence has interposed to preserve the divinely-inspired writings from all sorts of injury, is what we find to be false in fact, because there have been

spurious pieces fathered upon the apostles, as well as their successors." (pp. 41–2.)

"But is it not the common fate of books to suffer by frequent transcriptions? are they not all subject to the teeth of time, moths, and critics, unless preserved like the children of Israel's clothes by continued miracle? Why then may not St. Austin's rule serve us for the Fathers, as well as the apostles? Why may not the general design and sense of an author be understood, notwithstanding some corruptions, as easily as we distinguish an old acquaintance, though something disfigured by the small pox." (p. 44.)

A FAMOUS FALSEHOOD.

Under this heading, J. N. A. again vents his spleen against "doctors of divinity" in the following style, as found on pp. 217–18:

"Certain doctors of divinity have made a special effort to show that the 'stated day' of Pliny's epistle is the first day of the week. For this purpose they adduce a fabulous narrative which the historians of the Church have not deemed worthy of record. The argument is this: That in Pliny's time and afterward; that is, from the close of the first century and onward, whenever the Christians were brought before their persecutors for examination, they were asked whether they had kept the Lord's day, meaning thereby the first day of the week. And hence two facts are asserted to be established: 1. That when Pliny says that the Christians who were examined by him were accustomed to meet on a stated day, that day was undoubtedly the first day of the week. 2. That the observance of the first day of the week was the grand test by which Christians were known to their heathen persecutors. To prove these points Dr. Edwards makes the following statement:

"'Hence the fact that their persecutors, when they wished to know whether men were Christians, were accustomed to put to them this question, viz., "*Dominicum servasti?*"—"Hast thou kept the Lord's day?" If they had they were Christians. This was the badge of their Christianity, in distinction from Jews and Pagans. And if they said they had, and would not recant, they must be put to death. And what, when they continued steadfast, was their answer? "*Christianus sum; intermittere non possum;*"—"I am a Christian; I cannot omit it." It is a badge of my religion, and the man who assumes it must of course keep the Lord's day, because it is the will of his Lord; and should he abandon it, he would be an apostate from his religion.'"

In support of his position on this point, he brings to his aid Sir Wm. Domville. But who is Domville? He is an English barrister, or counselor at law, living in London, who published his work, *The Sabbath*, in 1849–50. That this Domville is a writer whose style pleases J. N. A. in his effort to put down "doctors of divinity," and the first-day Sabbath, is plainly seen by the following quotation from Domville, as given by him on p. 222:

"'One of those *daring misstatements* of facts so frequent in *theological writings*, and which, from the confident tone so generally assumed by the writers on such occasions, are usually received without examination, and allowed in consequence, to pass current for truth.'"

He then says to this, "The justice of Domville's language cannot be questioned," etc. But let the reader remember, that this Domville is down on *all Sabbaths*, both first-day, and *seventh-day Sabbaths*, as the following extract from his work will show:

"The *Sabbatarians*, however, as is well known, appeal for aid in THEIR DISTRESS to the JEWISH Scriptures, some arguing

the obligation to observe a Christian Sabbath, both from the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, and the command alleged by them to have been given at the creation to sanctify the seventh day." (p. 334.)

James Gilfillan, of Scotland, says of this Domville on p. 10 of his highly important work entitled *The Sabbath:*

"How would *Justin Martyr* and *Tertullian* have indignantly spurned the interpretation put on their words by a recent writer, when, to accomplish the *ungodly* and *unphilanthropic* purpose of overthrowing a Divine institution, he *neglects* to ascertain the meaning of words employed by ancient writers, or of their views elsewhere expressed, and charges them with saying what warranted the inference that, 'except during the time of Divine service, the Christians of that period lawfully might, and actually did, follow their worldly pursuits on the Sunday.'" (*Examin. of the Six Texts*, by Lyman, p. 274.)

Now we are prepared to hear the testimony of this Domville in the case referred to by J. N. A. as found on pp. 218–20 of the work under review. But to make the testimony of Domville the more impressive, we will first quote the remarks of J. N. A.:

"Mr. Gurney, an English first-day writer of some note, uses the same argument and for the same purpose. The importance attached to this statement, and the prominence given to it by the advocates of first-day sacredness, render it proper that its merits should be examined. Dr. Edwards gives no authority for his statement; but Mr. Gurney traces the story to Dr. Andrews, bishop of Winchester, who claimed to have taken it from the *Acta Martyrum*, an ancient collection of the acts of the martyrs. It was in the early part of the seventeenth century that Bp. Andrews first brought this forward in his speech

in the court of Star Chamber, against Thraske, who was accused before that arbitrary tribunal of maintaining the heretical opinion that Christians *are bound* to keep the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord. The story was first produced therefore for the purpose of confounding an observer of the Sabbath when being tried by his enemies for keeping that day. Sir Wm. Domville, an able anti-Sabbatarian writer, thus traces out the matter:

"'The bishop, as we have seen, refers to the *Acta* of the martyrs as justifying his assertion respecting the question, *Dominicum servasti?* but he does not cite a single instance from them in which that question was put. We are left therefore to hunt out the instances for ourselves, wherever, if anywhere, they are to be found. The most complete collection of the memoirs and legends still extant, relative to the lives and sufferings of the Christian martyrs, is that by Ruinart, entitled, "*Acta primorum Martyrum sincera et selecta.*" I have carefully consulted that work, and I take upon myself to affirm that among the questions there stated to have been put to the martyrs, in and before the time of Pliny, and for nearly two hundred years afterward, the question, *Dominicum servasti?* does not once occur, nor any equivalent question.'"

To this J. N. A. replies:

"This shows at once that no proof can be obtained from this quarter, either that the 'stated day' of Pliny was the first day of the week, or that the martyrs of the early Church were tested by the question whether they had observed it or not. After quoting all the questions put to martyrs in and before Pliny's time, and thus proving that no such question as is alleged, was put to them, Domville says:

"'This much may suffice to show that *Dominicum servasti?* was no question in Pliny's time, as Mr. Gurney intends us to believe it was. I have, however, still other proof of Mr. Gurney's unfair dealing with the subject, but I defer stating it for the present, that I may proceed in the inquiry what may have been the authority on which Bp. Andrews relied when stating that *Dominicum servasti?* was ever a usual question put by the heathen persecutors. I shall with this view pass

over the martyrdoms which intervened between Pliny's time and the fourth century, as they contain nothing to the purpose, and shall come at once to that martyrdom the narrative of which was, I have no doubt, the source from which Bp. Andrews derived his question, *Dominicum servasti?* "Hold you the Lord's day?" This martyrdom happened A. D. 304. The sufferers were Saturninus and his four sons, and several other persons. They were taken to Carthage, and brought before the proconsul Amulinus. In the account given of their examinations by him, the phrases, "CELEBRARE *Dominicum*," and "AGERE *Dominicum*," frequently occur, but in no instance is the verb "*servare*" used in reference to *Dominicum*. I mention this chiefly to show that when Bp. Andrews, alluding, as no doubt he does, to the narrative of this martyrdom, says the question was, *Dominicum servasti?* It is very clear he had not his author at hand, and that in trusting to his memory, he coined a phrase of his own.' "

But who does Domville call to his aid to support him in his assertions? (1) Ruinart; (2) The editors of the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine's works; (3) Gesner, who in his Latin Thesaurus published 1749, gives, etc. With such an aversion as J. N. A. appears to have toward the diabolical system of the Popery, how could he put such confidence in Domville's witnesses, who, a part at least, were Benedictine monks! But when did these monks flourish? Ruinart died in 1709, Gesner died in 1787; and when "the editors" died we are not prepared to say. Bp. Andrews died in 1646. "Ruinart" was not born till 1657—31 years after Bp. Andrews died! Domville himself has to speak highly of Bp. Andrews as will be seen by pp. 259–60, of his book. He says: "For Bp. Andrews was no bigot"—he was a "learned and respectable prelate."

Why then call in witnesses—Catholic monks—to impeach the "learned and respectable prelate," in regard to historical facts which occurred in the early part of the Christian era; when these same monks were not *born* until years after the "learned bishop" was dead! Who had the best opportunity for consulting the early history of the Church? Domville himself acknowledges (see p. 219) "the most complete collection of the memoirs and legends still extant, relative to the lives and sufferings of the Christian martyrs, is that by Ruinart." And then he adds: "I have carefully consulted *that work*, and I take upon *myself* to *affirm* that among the questions THERE stated to have been put to the martyrs in and before the time of Pliny, and for nearly two hundred years afterward, the question, *Dominicum servasti?* does not once occur; nor any equivalent question." (The italics are ours.)

Now, after such an effort on the part of J. N. A. and Domville, to make it appear "that no proof can be obtained" in support of the fact, that the question, "*Dominicum servasti?*" was ever "put to the martyrs," in the early history of the Christian Church, we will give the following, found on p. 7 of the celebrated work of Gilfillan:

"The Sabbatic controversy now [first centuries] passes into two—one between Jews and Christians; the other between Christians and the adherents of Paganism. In each of these new conflicts, as in the old, one of the parties is subjected for

a time to persecution for its opinions. A new power, it is felt, has come into the field. Its wider and more rapid ascendancy produces a more determined resistance than had been offered to the less aggressive and energetic system which it has succeeded. Christianity is assailed with a proportionate severity by the heathen. The Jews also turn persecutors, and, like Herod and Pilate, they and the Pagans, who before were at enmity between themselves, are made friends together. From the days of the apostles downwards for many years, the followers of Christ had no enemies more fierce and unrelenting than that people, who cursed them in the synagogue, sent out emissaries into all countries to calumniate their Master and them, and were abettors, wherever they could be, of the martyrdom of men, such as Polycarp, of whom the world was not worthy. Among the reasons of this deadly enmity was the *change of the Sabbatic day.* The Romans, though they had no objection on this score, punished the Christians for the faithful observance of their day of rest, one of the testing questions put to the martyrs being, *Dominicum servasti?*—HAVE YOU KEPT THE LORD'S DAY?" (Baron *An. Eccles.* A. D. 303. Num. 35, etc.)

This shows that Domville did not consult the proper authorities for correct information. If he had have done so, he might have saved himself labor, and his readers from a great amount of error.

Next, J. N. A. devotes about twenty pages to what he calls the

"ORIGIN OF THE FIRST-DAY OBSERVANCE."

He begins on p. 224, saying:

"The festival of Sunday is more ancient than the Christian religion: its origin being lost in remote antiquity. It did not originate however from any divine command or from piety to-

ward God: on the contrary, it was set apart as a sacred day by the heathen world in honor of their chief god, the sun. It is from this fact that the first day of the week has obtained the name of Sunday."

Then he pretends to give Webster's definition of Sunday, as follows:

"'Sunday; so called because this day was anciently dedicated to the sun or to its worship. The Christian Sabbath; the first day of the week.'"

But why did he not give the whole of Webster's definition? Perhaps the reader can judge better why he did not, when he shall have seen the whole definition. The following is the definition of Sunday and also of Sabbath:

"*Sunday.* The Christian Sabbath; the first day of the week, a day consecrated to rest from secular employments, and to religious worship. It is called also the LORD'S DAY. Many pious persons, however, *discard* the use of *Sunday*, and call the day the SABBATH. (See SABBATH.)"

"*Sabbath.* The day which God appointed to be observed as a day of rest from all secular labor or employments, and to be kept holy and consecrated to his service and worship. This was originally the seventh day of the week, the day on which God rested from the work of creation; and this day is still observed by the *Jews*, and *some* Christians as the Sabbath. But the Christian Church very early began, and still continue to observe the first day of the week, in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ on that day, by which the work of redemption was completed. Hence it is often called the *Lord's day.* The heathen nations in the north of Europe dedicated this day to the *sun*, and hence their Christian descendants continue to call the day *Sunday.* But in the United States, Christians

have to a great extent discarded the heathen name, and adopted the Jewish name *Sabbath*. *Sabbath* is not strictly synonymous with *Sunday*. *Sunday* is the *mere name* of the *day*; *Sabbath* is the name of the INSTITUTION. *Sunday* is the *Sabbath* of Christians; *Saturday* is the *Sabbath* of the Jews."

We now pass to p. 227, where J. N. A. says:

'The reasons which induced the Church to adopt the ancient festival or the heathen as something made ready to hand, are thus stated by Morer:

"'It is not to be denied but we borrow the name of this day from the ancient Greeks and Romans, and *we allow that the old Egyptians* worshiped the sun, and as a standing *memorial* of their veneration, dedicated this day to him. And we find by the influence of their examples, *other* nations, and among them the *Jews themselves*, doing him homage; yet these *abuses* did not hinder the Fathers of the Christian Church simply to repeal, or altogether lay by, the day or its name, but only to *sanctify* and improve both as they did also the *Pagan temples* polluted before with idolatrous services, and other instances wherein those *good men* were *always tender to work any other change* than what was necessary, and in such things as were plainly inconsistent with the Christian religion; so that Sunday being the day on which the Gentiles solemnly adored that planet, and called it Sunday, partly from its influence on that day especially, and partly in respect to its divine body (as they conceived it) the Christians thought fit to keep the same day and the same name of it, that they might not appear causelessly peevish, and by that means hinder the conversion of the Gentiles, and bring a greater prejudice than might be otherwise taken against the Gospel.'" (Italics are ours.)

Again we ask, Why did J. N. A. leave out the most important part of Morer's testimony? We will begin with the very next word to that with which he closed his quotation, and give the following language, and then the reader can judge why he thought best to garble the testimony of this witness:

"They kept therefore the same day and spent it in religious worship, though with very great difference both in the *manner* of worship, and the *objects* of it: the *one* party serving the Creator, the *other* the creature. And this they might safely do without any regard to the *sun*, because it was the *day* on which the Lord Christ arose from the dead; a miracle of that virtue and of so great concern for the welfare of Christians, that it was very seemly to set apart some particular time for the commemoration of it; and certainly no better time than the *day itself* on which the thing was done, though falling in with *that* which the *Infidels* spent in their superstition. And then as for the name which they promiscuously used and by common consent called it Sunday. This did not in the least derogate from the honor of our festival, because the Gentiles observed and called it so as well as *we*. For although with them the *reason* of the name was because on *that* day they adored the sun for his more beneficial aspect at that time; yet this motive made no impression on the Christian, who indeed adored the sun, but it was *that Sun*, saith St. Augustine, which the Scripture calls the *Sun of righteousness, who arose with healing in his wings* (Mal. 4: 2); and on this account it is called Sunday: because on this day Christ was raised from death to life to enlighten the children of this world, and by his triumphant resurrection caused the heavenly light of truth and grace to appear in full lustre to them, who before sat in darkness and the shadow of death. Hence it is that *this word* is so often found in *ancient* writings to signify *this* great holiday which we *now celebrate* and was always kept from the beginning of Christianity in honor of our *Redeemer*, the Sun of the prophet Malachi, and not the ordinary star which the heathens worshiped, and from whom we seem to derive the name, but is much improved beyond the reach of their religion."

We now pass over J. N. A.'s work from p. 227 to p. 243, with feelings of regret that any man should

be so misled as to devote his energies to a cause so unworthy a Christian! It is not often we find so much sophistical reasoning as is contained in the above named pages. History has been garbled, and another attempt made to impeach the testimony of the early Christian Fathers, so as to turn the scale of evidence in favor of the seventh-day Sabbath! This will be seen by any intelligent and well informed reader of early ecclesiastical history. But the common reader can ascertain the fact if he will examine the preceding pages of this work, where are found the extracts from various histories, which we have given under the heading of "The Voice of Historians."

On p. 245 J. N. A. says:

"Of the observance of the Sabbath in the early Church, Morer speaks thus:

"'The primitive Christians had a great veneration for the Sabbath, and spent the day in devotion and sermons. And it is not to be doubted but they derived this practice from the apostles themselves.'"

To show how J. N. A. was pleased to garble this testimony of Morer, we will quote the conversation as found in Morer (pp. 189–90):

"*The Holy Fathers*, saith Basalmon, *made the Sabbath and the Lord's day to stand on the same ground*, and they were equally respected in ancient times. And though in the Western Church especially this custom wore off by degrees, and is now altogether laid by, yet still there are some marks of it in other places, among the Æthiopians, Melchitæ, and Abyssins, Brerewood informs us; and Scaliger saith they call *both days*

by the name of *Sabbath*, the *first* and the *latter* Sabbath; or in their language, the one Sanbath Sachristos, CHRIST'S SABBATH, the other Sanbath Judi, the *Jews' Sabbath*. We must yield therefore that [here J. N. A. begins to quote] the Primitive Christians had a great veneratian for the Sabbath, and spent the day in devotion and sermons. And it is not to be doubted but they derived this practice from the apostles themselves [here J. N. A. closes], as appears by the several Scriptures to that purpose; who keeping both *that day* and the *first of the week*, gave occasion to the succeeding ages to join them together, and make it one festival, though there was not the same reason for the *continuance* of the custom, as there was to *begin* it. The Church had to do with two sorts of people; and her edification did much depend on their conversion, *Jews* and *Gentiles;* and therefore such a method was to be taken, as would be, in all appearance, most servicable to that *end*, and conduce to save them. (See 1 Cor. 9: 19–23.) That then *both* these might have good opportunities to hear the doctrine of the Gospel, it was found necessary that the apostles should preach on *both those days;* and being to deal with the *Jews* on the one hand, they assembled with them on that day which *they* [the Jews] dedicated to the reading of *Moses* and the *Prophets*."

Again, on p. 246 he quotes Coleman as follows:

"'The last day of the week was strictly kept in connection with that of the first day, for a long time after the overthrow of the temple and its worship. Down even to the fifth century the observance of the JEWISH Sabbath was continued in the Christian Church, but with a rigor and solemnity gradually diminishing until it was WHOLLY DISCONTINUED.'"

On this he makes the following remarks:

"This is a most explicit acknowledgment that the Bible Sabbath was long observed by the body of the Christian Church."

Why this change of language? To blind his read-

ers, he calls it "Bible Sabbath!" but he perverts his author, Coleman, who calls it *Jewish* Sabbath. Reader, do not overlook the fact that this *Jewish* Sabbath, as Coleman calls it, continued in the Christian Church to the fifth century, yet with a respect "gradually diminishing until it WAS WHOLLY DISCONTINUED." The following from Gilfillan (pp. 369–70) will show a harmony of views with the above quotations from Coleman:

"As 'the Sabbath' had been for so long a time the well-known title of the weekly holy day among the Jews, it was obviously needful for preventing mistakes, that the institution which had passed to a new day should have a new name. But as time advanced, and may not we add, as the Lord's day came to be no longer in danger of being confounded with the *Jewish* Sabbath, the old name was gradually resumed and attached to the *Christian holy day*. The earliest instance of the restoration of the word to its ancient honor, that we have discovered, occurs in a passage of Irenæus (A. D. 178), where, after showing that Christ in healing the sick did nothing 'beyond the law of the Sabbath-day,' he draws the conclusion, that 'the true sanctification of the Sabbath consists in doing works of mercy.' He is followed by Clemens Alexandrinus, who holds the eighth day 'to be properly the Sabbath, but the *seventh a working day;*' and by Origen, who says, 'Leaving the Jewish observances, let us see how the Sabbath ought to be kept by a Christian;' concluding his description with the words, 'This is the observance of the Christian Sabbath.' Examples might also be given from the writings of Gregory of Nyssa, Jerome, Augustine, Rufinus, and Chrysostom, but they belong to a later date. Several instances, doubtless, exist in which Augustine and others employ the word 'Sabbath' in its original acceptation. But *this they do* when they have occasion to mention and *discriminate* the *Jew-*

ish and *Christian* weekly days of rest; and, even in this case, they sometimes say, 'the *Jewish* Sabbath.' On other occasions they feel that there is *no need* of any explanatory or *qualifying* epithet when *they call the Lord's day the Sabbath.*"

Again, on p. 250 J. N. A. gives the following from Morer:

"'About the same time were the Hypsistarii who closed with these as to what concerned the Sabbath, yet would by no means accept of circumcision as too plain a testimony of ancient bondage. All these were heretics, and so adjudged to be by the Catholic Church. Yet their hypocrisy and industry was such as gained them a considerable footing in the Christian world.'"

But why did J. N. A. stop so short? Why not give the next which followed, according to Morer (p. 67):

"So that though the *Lord's day* had got a very great figure, and was well supported by those who presided in religious matters, yet for a long while the *Sabbath* kept its ground, and *both* together were respected as *two sisters*. And when in process of time the *Sabbath-day* grew somewhat feeble, and was at length forced to give way to her rival, the abettors and patrons of it, by a *Pythagorian*, or *Marcion* spell, recovered it in *our festival*, and changing now and then the name of the day, revived the *observation* of it, and made it as solemn and rigorous in Sunday, as ever it had been in the day before."

Passing over a few pages of his sophistical reasoning, we now come to p. 255, where J. N. A. gives us some very interesting statements in the following language:

"This extraordinary edict of Constantine caused Sunday to be observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been.

Yet we have the most indubitable proof that this law was a *heathen* enactment; that it was put forth in favor of Sunday *as a heathen institution* and *not* as a Christian festival; and that *Constantine himself* not only did not possess the character of a Christian, but was at that time in truth *a heathen.* It is to be observed that Constantine did not designate the day which he commanded men to keep as Lord's day, Christian Sabbath, or the day of Christ's resurrection; nor does he assign *any reason* for its observance which would indicate it *as a Christian* festival. On the contrary, he designates the ancient heathen festival of the sun in language that cannot be mistaken. On this important point Milman, the learned editor of Gibbon, thus testifies:

"'The rescript commanding the celebration of the Christian Sabbath, *bears no allusion* to its peculiar *sanctity as a Christian institution.* It is the day of the sun which is to be observed by the general veneration; the courts were to be closed, and the noise and tumult of public business and legal litigation were no longer to violate the repose of the sacred day. But the believer in the new paganism, of which the solar worship was the characteristic, might acquiesce without scruple in the sanctity of the first day of the week.'

"And he adds:

"'In fact, as we have before observed, the day of the sun would be willingly hallowed by almost all the pagan world.'"

But where did Milman *add* these last few words? We are compelled to pass in his history from p. 289, where we find the first extract, to p. 325; thirty-six pages, before we find what J. N. A. says, "he adds." But to make the thing plain, we had better notice what else Milman says in the same connection:

"On the state of society at large, on its different forms and gradations, little impression had as yet been made by Christianity. THE CHRISTIANS WERE STILL A SEPARATE PEOPLE; their literature was exclusively religious, and addressed, excepting in

its apologies, or its published exhortations against paganism, to the initiate alone. Its language would be unintelligible to those uninstructed in Christian theology. Yet the general legislation of Constantine, *independent of those edicts which concerned the Christian community* bears some evidence of the silent underworking of Christian opinion. The rescript, indeed, for the religious observance of the Sunday, which enjoined the suspension of all public business and private labor, except that of agriculture *was enacted*, according to the apparent terms of the decree, *for the whole Roman empire*. Yet, unless we had direct proof that the decree set forth the Christian reason for the sanctity of the day, *it may be doubted* whether the act would not be received by the greater part of the empire *as merely adding* one more festival to the *fasti* of the empire; as proceeding *entirely* from the will of the emperor, or even grounded on his authority as supreme pontiff, by which he had the plenary power of appointing holy days. [Here J. N. A. begins to quote.] In fact, as we have before observed, *the day of the sun* would be willingly hallowed by almost all *the* PAGAN *world* [Here J. N. A. closes], especially that part which had admitted any tendency toward the ORIENTAL *theology*." (The italics and capitals are mine.)

But let us now turn back to the extract, in J. N. A.'s own language as above quoted from p. 255, and notice some of his *admissions* in regard to the "edict of Constantine." He says, "*this law was a heathen enactment.*" Good. He says, also, "that it was put forth in favor of Sunday *as a* HEATHEN *institution*, and *not* as a Christian festival." Good. Mark it. He also says, "that Constantine himself not only did not possess the character of a Christian, but was at that time in truth *a heathen*." Good, again. And

then he adds: "It is to be observed that Constantine did not designate the day which he commanded men to keep as Lord's day, Christian Sabbath, or the day of Christ's resurrection; nor does he assign *any reason* for its observance which would indicate it *as a Christian festival.* On the *contrary,* he designates the *ancient heathen* festival of the *sun* in language that *cannot be mistaken.*" Thank J. N. A. for these important admissions. Happy for *once* to agree with him. But he still continues to make these important admissions, as on p. 257, where he says:

"That Constantine himself was a heathen at the time these edicts were issued, is shown not only by the nature of the edicts themselves, but by the fact that his nominal conversion to Christianity is placed by Mosheim two years after his Sunday law. * * * As a heathen, Constantine was the worshiper of Apollo or the sun, a fact that sheds much light upon his edict enjoining men to observe the venerable day of the sun."

Now let us take particular notice of what J. N. A. says on pp. 258–60:

"A few words relative to his character as a man will complete our view of his fitness *to legislate for the Church.* This man when elevated to the highest place of earthly power caused his eldest son Crispus to be privately murdered, lest the fame of the son should eclipse that of the father. In the same ruin was involved his nephew Licinius, 'whose rank was his only crime, and this was followed by the execution perhaps of a guilty wife.'

"Such was the man who elevated Sunday to the throne of the Roman empire; and such the nature of the institution which he thus elevated. A recent English writer says of Constantine's Sunday law, that it 'would seem to have been rather to promote *heathen* than *Christian* worship.'

"* * * Thus it is seen that a law enacted in support of a heathen institution after a few years came to be considered a Christian ordinance; and Constantine himself, four years after his Sunday edict, was able to control the Church, as represented in the general council of Nice, so as to cause the members of that council to establish their annual festival of the passover upon Sunday. Paganism had prepared the institution from ancient days, and had now elevated it to supreme power; its work was accomplished. It was now the part of popery to effect its transformation into a Christian institution; a work which it was not slow to perform. Sylvester was the bishop of Rome while Constantine was emperor. How faithfully he acted his part in transforming the festival of the sun into a Christian institution is seen in that he changed the name of the day, giving it the imposing title of LORD'S DAY. To Constantine and to Sylvester, therefore, the advocates of first-day observance are greatly indebted. The one elevated it as a heathen festival to the throne of the empire, making it a day of rest from most kinds of business: the other changed it into a Christian institution, giving it the dignified appellation of Lord's day. It is true that traces of resting from labor on that day, and individual instances of designating Sunday as Lord's day are found as early as Tertullian's time, at the opening of the third century; but it was the work of Constantine and of Sylvester in the early part of the fourth century to establish the festival of the sun, by the authority of the empire, and to render it a Christian institution by the authority of St. Peter."

Here we reach a point of vital importance to the theory of J. N. A. Based upon the erroneous idea which it draws from *garbled extracts from history*, and a *perversion of much of the language that is quoted*, J. N. A. rears his superstructure; the main pillar of which, I shall point out, and show that it rests upon the "sand!" This done, down must fall

his most fanciful structure in support of the seventh-day Sabbath. And if there can be found those who will then try to shelter themselves under the shattered materials of the demolished structure, we shall not envy their wisdom. Be it remembered, that J. N. A. *admits all we could desire* in regard to Constantine being a heathen, and that the "extraordinary edict" "was a heathen enactment" "put forth in favor of Sunday *as a heathen institution* and not as a Christian festival." Also, that it was "a law enacted in support of a heathen institution." But, why then does he say in the same connection, that Constantine in the passing of this edict, did "LEGISLATE FOR THE CHURCH!" And again in speaking of Sunday says: "Paganism had prepared the institution from ancient days, and had now elevated it to supreme power." And then adds: "It was now the part of popery to effect its transformation into a Christian institution!"

He then declares that "Sylvester," "bishop of Rome," "faithfully" "acted his part in transforming the festival of the sun into a Christian institution," and that he "changed the name of the day, giving it the imposing title of LORD'S DAY!" How could an honest Christian man make such statements as these! But to cap the climax, he says:

"To Constantine and to Sylvester, therefore, the advocates of first-day observance are greatly indebted. The one elevated it as a heathen festival to the throne of the empire, * * * the other changed it into a Christian institution, giving it the dignified appellation of Lord's day."

But the very next words J. N. A. was compelled to pen, were these:

"It is true that traces of resting from labor on that day, and individual instances of designating Sunday as Lord's day, are found as early as Tertullian's time, at the opening of the third century; but it was the work of Constantine and of Sylvester, in the early part of the fourth century, to establish the festival of the sun, by the authority of the empire, and to render it a Christian institution by the authority of St. Peter."

But let us repeat a part of the extract last quoted: "It is true that traces of resting from labor on that day, and individual instances of designating Sunday as Lord's day, are found as early as Tertullian's time!" Let the reader compare with this bold and untruthful statement, the following from Reeves and Mosheim. On. pp. 123–4 of Reeves' *Apology* (vol. I.), where he gives us a translation of Justin Martyr, we find it said:

"Upon the day called Sunday, all that live either in city or country meet together at the same place, where the writings of the prophets and apostles are read," etc.

Mosheim on p. 35 of his history says:

"Since then there was such a variety in the ritual and discipline of the primitive Churches, it must be very difficult to give such an account of the worship, manners, and institutions, of the ancient Christians, as will agree with what was practised in all those countries where the Gospel flourished. There are, notwithstanding, certain laws, whose authority and obligations were universal and indispensible among all Christians, and of these we shall here give a brief account. *All Christians* were unanimous in setting apart the *first day* of the week, on which

the triumphant Savior arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the Church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the EXPRESS APPOINTMENT OF THE APOSTLES, who *consecrated* that day to the same *sacred* purpose, and was observed *universally* throughout all the *Christian* Churches, as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers. The *seventh day* of the week was also observed as a festival, *not by the Christians in general*, but by such Churches *only* as were *principally composed of Jewish converts*." (Italics and small capitals are mine.)

How will such statements as these compare with J. N. A.'s bold and glaring assertions! Is such the foundation on which the seventh-day Sabbath rests? But we are not quite prepared to pass by the acknowledgment by J. N. A. introductory to the extract from Milman. In speaking of Constantine's edict in favor of Sunday, p. 255, he says, in regard to Constantine:

"Nor does he assign any reason for its observance which would indicate it as a Christian festival."

This being so, for what purpose does J. N. A. "assign" a "reason" so directly opposite! The reason is obvious. *He is compelled to do it*, in order to find a foundation for the main pillar of his worse than fanciful structure for maintaining his Judaizing notions of the seventh-day Sabbath! And the very language which he garbled from Milman most unequivocally "contradicts" his version of the matter! Let us repeat here the language of Milman (p. 255):

"The rescript commanding the celebration of the Christian Sabbath, bears no *allusion* to its peculiar sanctity *as a Christian institution.*" (Italics are mine.)

Now, if the reader will carefully examine J. N. A.'s argument (?) in Part II. of his pretended history of the Sabbath, he will find that the main drift of his sophistical reasoning tends to the untruthful idea that the Lord's day, or first day of the week as a day of rest and worship for the Christian Church, *rests chiefly upon the idea that* it WAS ESTABLISHED BY CONSTANTINE'S EDICT (because of "his fitness to legislate for the Church"); and upon the idea that "Sylvester transformed the festival of the sun into a Christian institution!" And also that the Papacy, the synods, and the councils, ever afterwards, supported this "heathen institution," by their acts in favor of "Sunday" as "a heathen institution." But did not the Papacy tamper also with prayer, with baptism, with the Lord's supper, with the marriage institution, and even with the seventh-day Sabbath? We shall see. And if we must discard the Lord's day, or the Christian Sabbath, *because the Papacy tampered with it for unholy purposes,* we might also discard every sacred and religious ordinance of the Gospel for the same reason; and as Charlotte Elizabeth once said, "as well may we blot out the ninety-first Psalm, because the devil quoted it, and for a truly devilish purpose." So, then, if seventh-day advocates would be consistent, they should discard Jesus Christ as our mediator, because the

Papists add other mediators to their list: such as the "Blessed Virgin," "St Michael," "St. Peter," "St. Paul," and a host of other saints to whom they pray; as well as to discard the first day of the week as the true Sabbath, because the Papists made it a festival."

But let us see if the Papacy tampered with other sacred institutions as with the Lord's day.

I. PRAYER.

On p. 311 of *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, Coleman says:

"About the same time written forms of *prayer* begin to be the subject of remark and discussion by the *Fathers* and in *councils*. The third council of Carthage, A. D. 397, *decreed* that no one should use any *prayers* which he may have copied out for himself, unless he first collated them in connection with brethren better informed. Augustine, of the same age, complains that many, in the simplicity of their ignorance, make use of *prayers* composed not only by unskillful babblers, but even by heretics. And the council of Milive, A. D. 402, as given in the African code, *ordered that all prayers* which had been *approved in council* might be used by all, and that no other, unless approved by the more discreet, should be rehearsed."

II. BAPTISM.

Coleman on p. 396 says:

"The sacramentary of *Gregory the Great* directs that the person to be *baptized* should be *immersed* at the mention of each of the persons of the Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." "*Single immersion* was at times considered

valid. This decision was given by *Gregory the Great*, in a controversy with the Arians in Spain, who maintained that trine *immersion* denoted THREE GRADATIONS in the Godhead. Gregory, on the contrary, declared *baptism by single immersion to be valid*, and aptly significant of the *unity* of the Deity. This decision was afterward confirmed by the council of Toledo, A. D. 633."

Also, on p. 402 he says:

"*Signing with the sign of the cross.* To this Christians now attached great importance, and ascribed to it a wonderful efficacy. It was, moreover, the sign and seal of faith, the surrendry of the candidate up to Christ, and the solemn indication that he had passed from a state of sin to a state of grace. It was given after the ceremony of exorcism, and immediately before *baptism*, the officiating person saying, '*Receive thou the sign of the cross upon thy forehead and on thy heart.*'"

On. p. 403 Coleman says of "*Ceremonies after Baptism:*"

"(1) *The kiss of peace.* This is mentioned as being usual on this occasion as late as the fifth century. (2) *Chrism.* This anointing is still in use in the East. (3) *Clothing in white apparel.* These garments were worn as emblems of purity, the putting away of former defilements, etc. Thus the young disciple was arrayed in the white robes, in which saints and angels appear in heaven. This practice was in common use in the fourth century. The dress was worn by the newly *baptized* from Easter-eve until the Sunday after, which was from this circumstance called *Dominica in albis*—the Sunday in white. These garments were made usually of white linen, but sometimes of more costly material, and were worn by the person who baptized as well as by the subjects of baptism. (4) *The burning of lighted tapers.* These were placed in the hands of the baptized, if adults; if they were infants, in the hands of the spon-

sors. These tapers were emblematical of the illuminating power of this ordinance. (5) *The washing of the feet.* This was at times a favorite ceremony in the Churches of *Africa* and *France;* and is still retained in the *Greek Church.*"

Benedict (vol. I., p. 62) says:

"We have now arrived at the period in which *baptism* was exalted to a most astonishing pre-eminence. Its efficacy was the constant theme of pulpit declaimers, and its praises were chanted by all who could sing. *Laws were enacted, canons were made,* and the most vigilant precautions were taken by popes and princes, and every order of ecclesiastics, by nurses and midwives, and every benevolent creature in Christendom, that *no human being,* whether adult or infant, whether born or unborn, should depart to the world of spirits *without this heavenly passport. Baptism,* indeed, suffered violence, and the violent took it by force."

III. LORD'S SUPPER.

Says Coleman:

"After the seventh century, it began to be used to designate the *mass,* which was offered in the *Roman Catholic Church* for the dead," etc. (p. 414.) "It became, however, the practice, both in the Eastern and Western Churches, to apply this epithet (liturgy) to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But in the *Roman Catholic Church,* it finally gave place to the same MASS." (p. 415.) "It was an ancient custom to administer the sacrament to the sick in the last stages of life, and also to put the sacred *elements in the coffin of the deceased.*" (p. 417.) "The *communion table* was *common.* * * * It was first a *simple table;* * * * was at first made of *wood.* * * * Altars wrought from stone became common in the time of Constantine, and in the Western Church were required by ecclesiastical authority in the beginning of the sixth century." (p. 427.)

"As early as the *seventh* century, and especially during the *eighth* and *ninth*, the fictitious doctrine of a miraculous, and as it were magical, change of the elements of the Lord's Supper *into the body and blood of Christ* began to gain ground." (p. 429.) "It afterward became customary for the presbyters to keep *consecrated bread*, called *eulogia*, to offer to such persons as chose to partake of it instead of uniting in regular communion with the Church. To this *substitute* for *full communion*, it is easy to refer the origin of PRIVATE MASSES, and of communion *in one kind*. This perversion of the ordinance became common in the *thirteenth century*. To the same origin may, perhaps, be traced the idea of a half-way covenant, which has at times prevailed in the Church. They that received the *eulogia* in the place of the *sacrament* were called *half-way communicants*." (p. 431.)

"It was the custom of the Church, at different times and in various places, to administer the *sacrament even to the dead*, and also to *bury* some of the *consecrated elements with the dead*." (p. 432.) "From the *seventh century*, the *Church at Rome* used *unleavened* bread; and the Church at Constantinople continued the use of common *fermented* bread: but the *controversy* between the two Churches on the subject originated with Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in the year 1053, and was continued for some time with great bitterness. To this day the one continues the use of *leavened*, and the other of *unleavened bread*. * * * But Catholic superstition has raised many idle questions respecting the form and consistency of the bread, the mingling of *oil*, of *salt*, and of *cheese*, the image to be imprinted upon it, the inscription. * * * The *eucharistic bread* in the Church of *Rome* is styled the *host*, *hostia*. It consists of cakes, of meal and water, made small, circular, and thin, like *wafers*, by which name it is frequently called. * * * Indeed, this sacred ordinance of the *Lord's Supper*, in itself so simple and so impressive, has been *dishonored*, at times, by

casuistical discussions too ridiculous to be gravely related; and *desecrated* by rites TOO HORRIBLE TO BE MENTIONED." (pp. 436–8.)

"The use of *incense* in connection with the *sacrament* was unknown in the Church until the time of Gregory the Great, in the latter part of the sixth century. After this period it became prevalent in the Churches. It was one of a multitude of perversions which resulted from the attempt to make the sacrificial rites of the *Jewish dispensation* a pattern and type of the ordinances of the Christian Church. *The signing of the cross* has a higher antiquity. It is spoken of by Basil, Chrysostom, and Augustine, and is distinctly mentioned in the Apostolical Constitutions *as a part of the sacramental service.* This ceremony may have been the means of exciting the devotion and confirming the faith of the early Christians, but it became the occasion of such superstition that it is deservedly neglected in Protestant Churches. *The Roman missal* directs the use of *this sign* no less than *fifty-five times.*" (p. 443.) "From the third century *this ordinance, like that of baptism,* began to be encumbered with other rites, which accumulating from age to age, overlaid it with *endless ceremonials and superstitions..*" (p. 450.)

"*Maunday Thursday.* This was the fifth day of Passion Week, called also *dies mandati,* etc. It was observed by the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and for a long time after the ancient love-feasts were discontinued, this day was observed as a feast of love. With these ceremonies was also joined that of WASHING THE FEET *by catechumens and candidates for baptism.* The *creed* was also publicly rehearsed by them on this day, and pardon was extended to the penitent, hence called *dies indulgentiæ.*"

IV. MARRIAGE.

Says Coleman:

"To these views of the Church may be traced the ancient sentiments respecting the *celibacy of the clergy*, which prevailed as early as the fourth century, and in the twelfth required of them the *vow of celibacy* in the *Roman Catholic Church*. From the *fourth* to the *sixth* century the opinions of different parties were greatly divided. Many bishops, particularly in the Eastern Church, continued to live in the marriage relations into which they had entered before their consecration. The *decrees of Councils* on this subject are contradictory." (p. 237.)

"The laws of *Christian marriage* seem, at first view, to be derived from the Mosaic regulations on this subject, and yet it is remarkable that, until the sixth or seventh century, the marriages of the early Christians were regulated rather by the *Roman* than by the *Mosaic* laws * * * For the *first five centuries* the Church had no further concern with the *laws of marriage* than to *censure* them, as occasion required, and to restrict the observance of them, by her discipline and authority. *The laws of the State*, and the *regulations of the Church*, on this subject, *were first made to harmonize under the* EMPEROR JUSTINIAN. By making the sacerdotal benediction an *essential* part of the *marriage covenant*, and by exalting this covenant to the dignity of a *sacrament*, the *clergy* found the means of *magnifying* their office and increasing their *authority* over the people." (pp. 493–7.)

V. THE HEATHEN, OR THE PAPACY, TAMPERING WITH THE SEVENTH DAY.

Says Peter Heylyn, in his *History of the Sabbath:*

"As for the *Saturday*, that retained its wonted credit in the

Eastern Church, *little inferior* to the *Lord's day*, if not plainly equal: *not as a Sabbath*, think not so; but as a day designed unto sacred meetings. The *constitutions* of the apostles, said to be written by Clemens, one of *St. Peter's* first successors in the Church of *Rome*, appoint both days to be observed as solemn festivals: both of them to be days of rest; that so the servant might have time to repair unto the Church, for his edification. * * * Beginning with the Synod held in Laodicea, a town of Phrygia, *Anno* 314, there passed a Canon touching the reading of the Gospels, with the other Scriptures upon the *Saturday* or *Sabbath;* that in the time of Lent there should be no oblation made, but on the *Saturday* and the Lord's day only; neither that any festival should be then observed in memory of any martyrs, but that their names only should be commemorated, upon the Lord's day and the *Sabbáths.* * * * It seems the *Saturday* was held in a fair esteem, and joined together with the Sunday. * * * Sure I am Socrates counts *both days* for weekly festivals, and adds, that on them both the congregation used to be assembled, and the whole liturgy performed: which plainly shows, that in the practice of those Churches they were both regarded, both alike observed. *Gregory Nyssen* speaks more home and unto the purpose. Some of the people had neglected to come unto the Church upon the *Saturday;* and on the Sunday he thus chides and rebukes them for it: '*With what face* [saith the Father] *wilt thou look upon the Lord's day which hast dishonored the Sabbath, knowest thou not that these days are sisters, and that whoever doth despise the one, doth affront the other?*' Sisters indeed, and so accounted in those Churches, not only in regard of the public meetings, but in this also, that they were both exempt from the *Lenten Fast.*" (p. 426.)

"It seems the Lord's day keeps that honor which before it had; and that the *Saturday* continues in the same regard, wherein once it was; both of them counted days of feasting,

and both retained for the assemblies of the Church. * * * [And] that for the Lord's day, and the *Saturday*, and other festivals, they used to go unto the Church on the eve before, and almost at midnight, where they continue till the breaking up of the congregation." (p. 471.)

James Gilfillan says:

"All *vicars* were required, even at so late a time in mediæval history as 1360, to read the Word of God to the people in their own language. Repeatedly do we find more frequent communicating urged as a means of promoting Sabbatic observance. With the same view *councils* defined the time of holy rest, and exhorted the people to be present at the public worship of *Saturday*." (p. 392.)

What will J. N. A. and his readers say to this? Did not the *Papacy*, or the *Heathen*, tamper with the *seventh-day* Sabbath; as well as with the first day? Consistency, thou art a jewel!

DAYS OF THE WEEK NAMED BY THE HEATHEN.

Why does J. N. A. make such an ado about the "Sunday," because the *heathen* named it thus in honor of the sun? The same objection applies to "*Saturday*." The heathen named it thus in honor of *Saturn*, as we will show. What is the meaning of *Saturday?* Webster defines it thus:

"*Saturday*—Saturn's day—the seventh or last day of the week; the day of the *Jewish* Sabbath."

Putman (*World's Progress*, p. 519) says:

"It was so called from an idol worshiped on this day by the

old Saxons, and according to Vertigern was named by them *Satern's-day.*"

That *Saturday* was a "heathen" name, as well as Sunday, let the following testify. Says Heylyn (pp. 422–3):

"They therefore are *more nice than wise*, who out of a desire to have all things new, would have new names for every day, or call them as sometimes they were, the *first day of the week*, *the second day of the week*, and all for fear lest it be thought that we do still adore those gods whom the *Gentiles* worshiped. Saint Augustine, as it seems, had met with some this way affected, and thus disputes the case with Faustus Manichæus. The Gentiles, saith the Father, gave unto every day of the week, the name of one or other of their gods; and so they did also unto every month. If then we keep the name of *March*, and not think of *Mars*, why may we not, saith he, preserve the name of Saturday, and not think of *Saturn?* I add [says Heylyn], Why may we not keep the name of *Sunday*, and not think of *Phœbus*, or *Apollo?* This, though it satisfied the Manichees, will not perhaps now satisfy some curious men, who did as much dislike the names of the *months*, as of the *days*. To others I presume it may give some reason why we retain the name of *Sunday*."

Much more might be said on this point, but we forbear.

LABOR ON SUNDAY.

As J. N. A. makes quite a vigorous attempt to weaken the testimony in favor of the first day of the week, by trying to show that the early Christians "*labored*" on that day, we will give a specimen of his language as found on p. 267:

"It was reserved for modern theologians to discover the divine or apostolic authority for Sunday observance. The ancient doctors of the Church were unaware that any such authority existed; and hence they deemed it lawful and proper to engage in usual worldly business on that day when their religious worship was concluded. Thus Heylyn bears witness:

"'St. Chrysostom confessed it to be lawful for a man to look to his worldly business on the Lord's day, after the congregation was dismissed.'"

Against such statements as these, we will place the following from Gilfillan, pp. 387–8:

"PRACTICAL TEACHINGS.

"On the important subject of the manner in which the Lord's day ought to be spent, the latter coincide with the earlier opinions of the Christian Church. Eusebius, after mentioning the transference of the Sabbath and its duties to the first day of the week, observes, 'These duties more appropriately belong to this day, because it has a precedence, is first in rank, and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath.' He continues, 'It is delivered to us that we should meet together on this day, and it is ordered that we should do those things announced in this Psalm.' (In *comment.* on Ps. 91, 92.) We see what idea of the sacredness of the day Athanasius entertained, when he described, 'a multitude of soldiers with arms, drawn swords, bows, and spears, proceeding to attack the people, though it was the Lord's day.' (*Histor. Tracts* [Oxford, 1843], p. 192.) Cyril thus addressed his hearers: 'Manual labor is forbidden on a feast-day, that you may exercise yourselves more entirely in Divine matters.' (Lib. 8, c. 5, in Joan.) The Council of Laodicea, while they repudiated the regular cessation of work on Saturday, enjoined abstinence from labor on the Lord's day. In unison with these sentiments is the language of Chrysostom in the following exhortation to

his flock: 'You ought not, when you have retired from the Church assembly, to involve yourselves in engagements contrary to the exercises in which you have been occupied, but immediately on coming home read the sacred Scriptures, and call together the family, wife and children, to confer about the things that have been spoken, and after they have been more deeply and thoroughly impressed upon the mind, then proceed to attend to such matters as are necessary for this life.' (*Hom.* 5, in Matt.) The last clause has, in the absence of better arguments, been eagerly laid hold of to show that the preacher approved of a return to worldly business after the public and private duties of religion had been discharged. Not to mention the incompatibility of such a recommendation with the moral object aimed at in the homily, if not even with the physical powers of his hearers, Chrysostom has elsewhere stated enough to satisfy us that he had no such meaning. In other passages of his works he says, 'The Lord's day hath rest and immunity from toils (*Hom.* 43, in 1 Cor. 16 : 1); and holds abstinence from worldly affairs on the day to be an immovable law.' (*Hom.* 5, in Matt.) To these might be added a variety of statements by the Fathers, which imply their conviction that worldly pleasures were to be shunned at the times sacred to heaven. We cite two or three in which that conviction is clearly expressed. 'The sanctification of the Sabbath,' says Gregory Nazianzen, 'consists not in the hilarity of our bodies, nor in the variety of glorious garments, nor in eatings, the fruit whereof we know to be wantonness, nor in strewing of flowers in the way, which we know to be the manner of the Gentiles, but rather in the purity of the soul, and the cheerfulness of the mind, and pious meditations, as when we use holy hymns instead of tabors, and psalms instead of wicked songs and dancings.' (Quoted by Twisse in *Mor. of the fourth commandment*, p. 173.) Opposed though Augustine was to secular work, he was still more averse to the indulgence of worldly pleasure on the Lord's day. His

saying, 'It is better to plough than to dance,' is well known. It occurs in connection with a reference to the Jews, as in his time spending their Sabbath in idleness and pleasure: 'They are at leisure for trifles, and spend the Sabbath in such things as God forbids. Our rest is from evil works, theirs from good works. For it is better to plough than to dance.' (In Ps. 92.) But it was still better, in his view, to abstain from both, and to act in the spirit of his own words, 'Let us *show ourselves Christians by keeping* HOLY THE LORD'S DAY.' (*Ad Consul.*, Epist. 86.) The same spirit breathes in the words of Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Chrysostom."

But to sustain himself in such bold assertions about labor on the Lord's day, J. N. A. gives a garbled quotation introduced as follows:

"Morer justifies this Sunday labor in the following terms:

"'If we read that they did any work on the Lord's day, it is to be remembered that this application to their daily tasks was not till their worship was quite over, when they might with innocency enough resume them, because the length of time or the number of hours assigned for piety was not then so well explained as in after ages. * * * Christianity had got into the throne, as well as into the empire. Yet for all this, the entire sanctification of the Lord's day proceeded slowly: and that it was the work of time to bring it to perfection, appears from the several steps the Church made in her constitutions, and from the decrees of emperors and other princes, wherein the prohibitions from servile and civil business, advanced by degrees from one species to another till the day got a considerable figure in the world.'"

It will be seen by the foregoing extract from Morer, that J. N. A. gives us the marks of an omitted portion, as though it was unimportant to the main question. But we will give the ommitted portion, and the reader will readily perceive that Morer would not be a very good witness for J. N. A. if the

whole of his testimony had been given. On p. 236 Morer says:

"The state of the Church is vastly different from what it was in those early days. *Christians* then for some *centuries* of years were under *persecution* and *poverty:* and besides their own wants they had many of them *severe masters who* COMPELLED *them to work,* and made them bestow less time in *spiritual* matters than they otherwise would."

This gives us the *reason why* the early Christians labored on the first day of the week. "*They had severe masters who* COMPELLED *them to work.*" So the reader will readily see that, it was quite important for the seventh-day theory, to *leave out a part* of Morer's language.

THE DARK AGES—THE WALDENSES.

We will now pass to p. 272, where J. N. A. says:

'The true people of God now retired for safety into places of obscurity and seclusion, as represented by the prophecy: 'The woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days.' Leaving their history for the present, let *us follow* that of the *Catholic Church,* and trace in its record the history of the *Sunday festival* through the period of the dark ages."

There is some weakness here, as J. N. A. *leaves* the "history" of "the true people of God," and again takes a "plunge" into the "bogs and mires" of "the *Catholic Church,*" in order to "trace in its record the history of the *Sunday festival* through the period of

the dark ages." This has been J. N. A.'s fault all through his "secular history," as he lost sight of "*the true people* OF GOD," and then, being deluded, was led astray from the true history of the "Lord's day," as connected with the *Church of Christ.* Hence, he was led, in his "bewilderment," to follow the *Catholic Church*, and thus "trace in its record the history of the *Sunday festival*" of the CHURCH OF ROME! But let the reader turn back in this work, and carefully examine the chapter relating to the Waldenses, or the true Church in the times of the "dark ages," and he will find that "the true people of God" were sacredly observing the LORD'S DAY, or first-day Sabbath, while the Church of Rome observed their "*Sunday festival.*"

Again we pass in J. N. A.'s history (?), from p. 272 to p. 294 treating on the "Dark Ages," where he has culled and picked from, or, in plain English, *garbled* his authors, and then by his sophistical reasoning therefrom, has greatly misled his readers. This must be plain to the well-informed student of ecclesiastical history, and deserves no more notice from me at this time. But let the reader remember, that J. N. A. has kept his readers in the "dark ages," and thus emphatically concealed from them "the true people of God." But when we reach p. 295 of J. N. A.'s work, we meet with something of interest to us, as the following will show:

"With the accession of the Roman bishop to supremacy be-

gan the dark ages; and as he increased in strength, the gloom of darkness settled with increasing intensity upon the world. The highest elevation of the papal power marks the midnight of the dark ages. That power was providentially weakened preparatory to the reformation of the sixteenth century, when the light of advancing day began to manifestly dissipate the gross darkness which covered the earth. The difficulty of tracing the true people of God through this period is well set forth in the following language of Benedict."

The reader will perceive by this, that J. N. A. begins to emerge from "the dark ages:" and though with some "difficulty," begins to trace "the true people of God," during "this period" of the "dark ages." He begins, as he says, with the following language of Benedict:

"'As scarcely any fragment of their history remains, all we know of them is from accounts of their enemies, which were always uttered in a style of censure and complaint; and without which we should not have known that millions of them ever existed. It was the settled policy of Rome to obliterate every vestige of opposition to her doctrines and decrees; everything heretical, whether persons or writings, by which the faithful would be liable to be contaminated and led astray. In conformity to this their fixed determination all books and records of their opposers were hunted up and committed to the flames. Before the art of printing was discovered in the fifteenth century, all books were made with the pen; the copies, of course, were so few that their concealment was much more difficult than it would be now; and if a few of them escaped the vigilance of the inquisitors, they would soon be worn out and gone. None of them could be admitted and preserved in the public libraries of the Catholics, from the ravages of time and of the

hordes of barbarians with which all parts of Europe were at different periods overwhelmed.'"

To this J. N. A. adds:

"Among the dissenters from the Romish Church in the period of the dark ages, the first place perhaps is due to the Waldenses, both for their antiquity and the wide extent of their influence and doctrine. Benedict quotes from their enemies respecting the antiquity of their origin:

"'We have already observed from Claudius Seyssel, the popish archbishop, that one Leo was charged with originating the Waldensian heresy in the valleys, in the days of Constantine the Great. When those severe measures emanated from the emperor Honorious against re-baptizers, the Baptists left the seat of opulence and power, and sought retreats in the country, and in the valleys of Piedmont; which last place in particular became their retreat from imperial oppression.'"

He then says:

"Dean Waddington quotes the following from a popish writer who had the best means of information respecting them:

"'Reiner Saccho, a Dominican, says of the Waldenses: "There is no sect so dangerous as the Leonists, for three reasons: first, it is the most ancient—some say it is *as old as Sylvester* [pope in Constantine's time] others *as the apostles themselves.* Secondly, it is very generally disseminated: there is no country where it has not gained some footing. Thirdly, while other sects are profane and blasphemous, this retains the utmost show of piety; they live justly before men, and believe nothing respecting God which is not good."'"

What does this say of the "Waldenses," or "true people of God?" It should be remembered, that J. N. A. here admits that they are "as old as Sylvester (pope in Constantine's time) others as the apostles themselves." Good! We are happy to agree with J. N. A. once more. But again, on p. 297 J. N. A. quotes Benedict, who "gives Saccho's own opinion as follows:"

"'Their enemies confirm their great antiquity. Reinerius Saccho, an inquisitor, and one of their most implacable enemies, who lived only eighty years after Waldo [A. D. 1160] admits that the Waldenses flourished five hundred years before that preacher. Gretzer, the Jesuit, who also wrote against the Waldenses, and had examined the subject fully, not only admits their great antiquity, but declares his firm belief that the Toulousians and Albigenses, condemned in the years 1177, 1178, were no other than the Waldenses.'"

Then on the same page J. N. A. says:

"Benedict quotes president Edwards as follows:

"'Some of the *popish writers themselves own* that that people NEVER SUBMITTED to the CHURCH OF ROME. One of the popish writers, speaking of the Waldenses, says the heresy of the Waldenses is the oldest heresy in the world. It is supposed that this people first betook themselves to this desert, secret place among the mountains to hide themselves from the severity of the heathen persecutions which were before Constantine the Great, and thus the woman fled into the wilderness from the face of the serpent. (Rev. 12: 6, 14.) And the people being settled there, their posterity continued there from age to age afterward; and being, as it were, by natural walls as well as God's grace, separated from the rest of the world, NEVER PARTOOK OF THE OVERFLOWING CORRUPTION.'"

And again, on p. 298 he says:

"Benedict makes other quotations relative to their origin:

"'Theodore Belvedre, a popish monk, says that the heresy had always been in the valleys. In the preface to the French Bible the translators say that they [the Valdenses] have *always* had the full enjoyment of the heavenly truth contained in the *holy Scriptures ever since they were enriched with the same by the* APOSTLES; having in fair MSS. preserved the *entire* Bible in their native tongue from generation to generation.'"

Then again on p. 300 J. N. A. quotes Dr. Allix as follows, in relation to the Waldenses:

"'They declare themselves to be the apostles' successors, to

have apostolical authority, and the keys of binding and loosing. They hold the Church of Rome to be the whore of Babylon, and that ALL THAT OBEY HER ARE DAMNED, especially the clergy that are subject to her SINCE *the time of* POPE SYLVESTER. * * * They hold that *none* of the *ordinances* of the Church that have been introduced *since Christ's ascension* ought to be observed, being of no worth; the feasts, fasts, orders, blessings, offices of the Church and the like, they *utterly reject.*'"

How can J. N. A. harmonize such language as this with the statements he was pleased to make on p. 259 where in speaking of *Sunday* he says:

"It was now the part of *Popery* to effect its *transformation* into a *Christian institution;* a work which it was not slow to perform. SYLVESTER was bishop of Rome while Constantine was emperor. How *faithfully* he acted his part in *transforming* the festival of the *sun into a Christian institution* [*!*] is seen in that HE *changed the name of the day* [*?*], giving it the imposing title of LORD'S DAY!!"

Let the reader carefully compare these bold assertions of J. N. A. with the quotation just made from Allix, and see how plainly they "contradict each other!"

EFFORT TO FIND SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH KEEPERS.

On p. 300, and forward, J. N. A. makes an effort to find seventh-day Sabbath keepers, "during the dark ages," in the following manner:

"A considerable part of the people called Waldenses bore the significant designation of *Sabbati*, or *Sabbatati*, or, *Insabbatati*. Mr. Jones alludes to this fact in the following words:

"'Because they would not observe saints' days, they were falsely supposed to neglect the Sabbath also, and called *Insabbatati* or *Insabbathists*.'

"Mr. Benedict makes the following statement:

"'We find that the Waldenses were sometimes called *Insabbathos;* that is, regardless of Sabbaths. Mr. Milner supposes this name was given to them because they observed not the Romish festivals, and rested from their ordinary oocupations only on Sundays. A Sabbatarian would suppose that it was because they met for worship on the seventh day, and did regard not the first-day Sabbath.'

"Mr. Robinson states the views of previous writers—though himself of a different opinion—in the following language:

"'SOME of these Christians were called *Sabbati, Sabbatati, Insabbatati*, and more frequently *Inzabbatati*. * * * One says they were so named from the Hebrew word *Sabbath*, because they kept the Saturday for the Lord's day. Another says they were so called because they rejected all the festivals or Sabbaths in the low Latin sense of the word, which the Catholic Church religiously observed.'"

Again, on p. 303 J. N. A. continues thus:

"Another class of witnesses to the truth during the dark ages, bore the name Cathari; that is, Puritans. Jones speaks of them as follows:

"'They were a plain, unassuming, harmless, and industrious race of Christians, patiently bearing the cross after Christ, and both in their doctrines and manners, *condemning the whole system of idolatry and superstition which reigned in the Church of Rome*, placing true religion in the faith, hope, and obedience of the Gospel, maintaining a supreme regard to the authority of God in his Word, and regulating their sentiments and practices by that divine standard. Even in the twelfth century their numbers abounded in the neighborhood of Cologne, in Flanders, the south of France, Savoy, and Milan. "They were increased," says Egbert, "to great multitudes, throughout all countries."'

"That the Cathari did retain and observe the ancient Sabbath, is certified by their Romish adversaries. Dr. Allix quotes a Roman Catholic author of the twelfth century concerning

three sorts of heretics, the Cathari, the Passagii, and the Arnoldistæ. Allix says:

"'This Romish writer lays it down also as one of their opinions, "that the law of Moses is to be kept according to the letter, and that the keeping of the Sabbath, circumcision, and other legal observances, ought to take place. They hold also that Christ the Son of God is not equal with the Father, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, these three persons, are not one God and one substance; and as a surplus to these their errors, they judge and condemn all the doctors of the Church, and universally the whole Roman Church. Now since they endeavor to defend this their error by testimonies drawn from the New Testament and prophets, I shall with the assistance of the grace of Christ stop their mouths as David did Goliah's, with their own sword."'

"Dr. Allix quotes another Romish author to the same effect:

"'Alanus attributes to the Cathari almost the very same opinions in his first book against heretics, which he wrote about the year 1192.'

"These statements [says J. N. A.] of their views are given in the uncandid language of their enemies."

J. N. A. then says (p. 304):

"Mosheim gives the following account of them:

"'In Lombardy, which was the principal residence of the Italian heretics, there sprung up a very singular sect, known by the denomination of Passaginians, and also by that of the circumcised. They had the utmost aversion to the dominion and discipline of the Church of Rome; but they were at the same time distinguished by two religious tenets that were peculiar to themselves. The first was a notion that the observation of the law of Moses, in everything except the offering of sacrifices, was obligatory upon Christians; in consequence of which they circumcised their followers, abstained from those meats the use of which was prohibited under the Mosaic economy, and celebrated the Jewish Sabbath. The second tenet that distinguished this sect was advanced in opposition to the doctrine of three persons in the divine nature.'"

In this quotation, J. N. A. again *leaves out* a few words of Mosheim. About the fourth line from the

beginning of this quotation from Mosheim, between the word "circumcised" and the words "they had the utmost aversion," etc., let the reader insert—"like the other sect already mentioned," and he will then have it as found in Mosheim. But after all the doubt which hangs around the true meaning of the word "*Sabbati*," etc., and "Cathari," if it could be found that *this class* of Christians did really observe the seventh-day Sabbath, what then? It would only prove, what no intelligent historian will deny, that there has sometimes been a class of *Judaizers*, who have kept the seventh day for the Sabbath. But let us remember, that these "*Sabbati*" were *not* the Waldenses as a people. But, says Robinson, "SOME of these Christians were called Sabbati." And even J. N. A. himself says: "A considerable *part* of the people called Waldenses bore the significant designation of Sabbati," etc. Yes! a "*part*" of them! And so there is a "*part*," even to "*this day*," among us, who are classed among Christians, and yet keep the seventh-day Sabbath! But the point at issue is this: Did the Waldenses, as a people, keep the seventh day? or did they observe the "Lord's day?" On p. 302 J. N. A. quotes Jones as saying, that the Waldenses "kept the Sabbath-day." This quotation may be found in Jones' *Church History*, p. 260. But by turning back to p. 245 we shall find what Jones understood by the "Sabbath-day," as observed by the Waldenses. He says:

"That it is vain to implore the suffrages of the saints reigning with Christ in heaven, because they cannot help us; that it is to no purpose to spend one's time in singing, and saying the canonical hours; that we are to *cease from working on* NO DAY EXCEPT THE LORD'S DAY; that the holidays of saints are to be rejected; and that there is no merit in observing fasts instituted by the [Catholic] Church!"

Jones gives credit for this to the "celebrated Æneas Sylvius," as taken from his history of the Waldenses of Bohemia. Let the reader examine the chapter in this work devoted to the *Waldenses*, etc., and he will be satisfied that the Waldenses, as a Christian people, did not keep the seventh-day Sabbath. We shall now pass from J. N. A.'s "Dark Ages" to the time of the Reformation (p. 317), when he speaks thus:

"Calvin regarded the festival called the Lord's day as nothing but a human ordinance, and it is upon record that himself and his friends at Geneva 'debated whether the reformed, for the purpose of estranging themselves more completely from the Romish Church, should not adopt Thursday as the Christian Sabbath.' Another reason assigned by Calvin for this proposed change was 'that it would be a proper instance of Christian liberty.'

"It is a singular fact that the Presbyterian Church, which originated with Calvin, has since discovered that the Lord's day—which Calvin proposed to change from Sunday to Thursday, that the Reformed might not observe a Romish festival—is a divinely authorized memorial of the resurrection, enforced by the authority of the fourth commandment. The date, the occasion, and the discoverer himself of this important doctrine in modern theology, will be noticed in their place. That the

body of the reformers should have failed to recognize the authority of the fourth commandment, and that they did not turn men from the Romish festivals to the Sabbath of the Lord, is a matter of regret rather than of surprise."

Against such bold assertions, and perversions of the truth by J. N. A., let us place the following facts, as gathered from the late celebrated work on the Sabbath, by James Gilfillan of Scotland. But first, however, we will give an extract from Gilfillan, in regard to the "LORD'S DAY," for the fifteen centuries previous to the Reformation. On pp. 404–5 he says:

"From the facts set forth in this and two preceding sections, it appears that for fifteen centuries the first day of the week was under various names, recognized throughout Christendom as a divinely appointed day of worship and sacred rest; that it was regarded as the old ordinance of Paradise and Sinai, adapted by extrinsic changes to the New Economy; and that many writings, canons, edicts, and other measures, attested the concern of good men for its observance, and their conviction of its high dignity and excellence. It is not necessary to the evidence for the Sabbath, which the history of that long period supplies, that the language used respecting it, the measures employed on its behalf, and the performance of its duties, should have been immaculate. There have been writers—Dr. Heylyn, for example—who have subjected this evidence to a process of disingenuous, unjust, and naughty criticism, which shows a disposition to bear down rather than to discover truth, and under which, as generally applied, no document, no testimony, no man on trial for life, no interest, however important, could be safe. The marvel is, that amidst the growing corruption of a great part of that period, there was such an unanimity of opinion respecting the Lord's day, and that the day did not cease

to exist. Nor let it be said that the prevailing evil betrayed any inefficiency in the ordinance. From two causes at least—from endlessly multiplying holidays, which obscured its authority, and diluted its strength, and from the ever-increasing neglect and perversion of its essential agencies of instruction and worship—it was not allowed its full and proper influence. In all cases in which the Sabbath has been dissociated from enfeebling, demoralizing festivals of human device, and been joined to its natural allies of sound religious instruction, and a simple, pure worship, it has evinced itself to be the power of God in stemming the tide of error and immorality, and in making communities pious, virtuous, and happy. And that must be a mighty institute which has been found to live and bless mankind under manifold disadvantages, and which, in the case before us, crippled though it was, not only maintained its ground amidst such elements of destruction, but for so long a time prevented the entire overthrow of the religious and social edifice."

On the same page, Gilfillan says:

"THE SABBATH AT THE REFORMATION.

"In the controversy respecting a weekly holy day, parties have eagerly sought support for their respective opinions in the writings of the Reformers. These eminent men have, on the one hand, been represented as holding the common creed of Christians on the subject, although it is admitted that their language in several instances is not in seeming accordance with such views, and have, on the other, been considered as denying the Divine obligation of a stated day of sacredness and rest. Of late years scarcely a volume or tract in defence of the latter notion has appeared, which has not 'bristled' with the names of Luther and Calvin as the advocates of liberty from all Sabbatarian impositions."

Again, on pp. 456–7 we find Gilfillan speaking thus:

"ALLEGED ANTI-SABBATISM OF THE REFORMERS.

"The Reformers, as was shown in a former chapter, believed the Sabbath to be of Divine and perpetual obligation, regarded it as of supreme importance, and enforced as well as exemplified its sacred observance. It is not denied, however, that they sometimes expressed themselves respecting it in terms which have given occasion and some plausibleness to the charge of hostility to the institution. This is the more to be regretted that their unguarded language must have often been recited, as certainly it has repeatedly been printed, unaccompanied by their better utterances on the subject, and that many, in such a case, do not trouble themselves to inquire into the *circumstances*, so as to understand the proper import and value of the words employed. * * * If we duly weighed the *circumstances* of the Reformers, we should be disposed to moderate our estimate of the value of their judgment in this matter. They had, for example, but limited means for examining and discussing the subject. The Great Apostasy has ever been a *perversion*, not an *open renunciation* of Christianity—'a noble vine,' not rooted up, but 'turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine.' Rome, *professing to retain*, has yet *corrupted* EVERY DOCTRINE, INSTITUTION, AND LAW OF JESUS CHRIST—recognizing, for example, the *Mediator* between God and men, but associating with him *many other intercessors;* avowing adherence to the Scripture, but to the Scripture as supplemented and made void by the writings and traditions of men; and in short, without *discarding* the LORD'S DAY *adding* a number of *encumbering holidays*, giving them in many instances an honor equal and even superior to GOD'S OWN DAY, and claiming for 'the Vicar of Christ' lordship 'even of the Sabbath.' It was

thus with *arrogant claims*, and *gross abuses*, affecting the LORD'S DAY, not with the open denial of its authority, or rejection of its sacred character, that the Reformers had to grapple. The latter subjects formed no part of their controversy with Rome, and, indeed, had never come under discussion to any extent in the Church. Their circumstances did not call them particularly and critically to consider the *general question*, and judging from the small space allowed to the *weekly holy day* in their works, as well as from their occasional manner of writing respecting it, the institution appears to have received less than most other points in theology of their careful attention."

Also, on p. 467 he says:

'It may even be allowed that the Reformers erred to some extent in regard to the weekly holy day, while it is held that they did not thereby forfeit their claim to be ranked among the friends of the institution, inasmuch as the truth decidedly out weighs the error."

But to prove that the Reformers did believe the Sabbath was changed to the "first day of the week," we will give the following from the "Confession of Augsburg," and some of the Reformers, as quoted by Gilfillan. But first, let us see what the "confession of Augsburg" was. Putnam's *World's Progress* (p. 182) says:

"AUGSBURG CONFESSION OF FAITH.—The confession of articles of faith drawn up at Augsburg by *Melancthon*, and by him and *Luther* presented to the emperor Charles V. in 1530. It was divided into two parts; the *first*, consisting of *twenty-one articles*, and the *second* of *seven*, directly *opposed* to the *abuses* that had crept into the Church of *Rome*. The elector of Saxony, his son, and several other princes of Germany, signed this confession, which was delivered to the emperor in the pal-

ace of the bishop of Augsburg, and hence it is called the 'Confession of Augsburg.' "

Now we will hear what Gilfillan quotes from it, and from some of the Reformers. He says, on pp. 416–17:

" 'The general rule,' as we read in the *Confession of Augsburg*, 'abideth still in the moral law, that at certain times we should come together to these godly exercises; but the special day, which was but a ceremony, is free. Whereupon *the apostles* retained *not* the *seventh day*, but did rather *take the first day of the week for that use*, that by it they might admonish the godly both of their liberty and of Christ's resurrection.' We add a sentence from the same Confession, 'The true unity of the Church doth consist in several points of doctrine, in the true and uniform preaching of the Gospel, and *in such rites as the Lord himself hath set down*.' (Hall's *Harmony of Confessions*, p. 217.) * * * 'It was meet,' says Melanchthon, 'that the apostles should on this account'—the resurrection of Christ—'have changed the day.' (Well's *Practical Sabbatarian*, p. 612.) Bucer observes, 'The Lord's day was consecrated'—as a day on which the people might have nothing else to do than engage in religious services—'by the very apostles.' (*De Reg. Christ.* lib. i. c. 11.) 'The Sabbath,' according to Bullinger, 'is ordained of God not for rest in itself, for he nowhere alloweth idleness; therefore the rest of the Sabbath is commanded for another end, namely: for the diligent study of religion, for it is therefore commanded to rest from manual labor, that we may spend this whole day in the exercise of religion.' (On Rom. 14: 5.) The APOSTLES must have been *Calvin's 'ancients'* in the following words: 'It was not without reason, that the *ancients* substituted what *we* call the LORD'S DAY *in the room of the Sabbath*. For when the true rest, which the *old Sabbath symbolized*, had its *fulfillment* in the *resurrection of Christ*, by

that very day which ended the shadows, Christians are warned not to cleave to the shadowy ceremonial.' (*Instit. Fourth Commandment.*) If *Calvin* had represented Christians as substituting the Lord's day for the Sabbath, he would, in contradiction to his own solemn protest, have justified one of the pretentions of *Rome*, that of affecting power to *change times and laws.* Such a power is greater than that of prescribing a single duty of the first day of the week; and yet for this the word of an inspired apostle was required, for, as Calvin says, 'It was for this use'—the peace [the good] of Christian society—'that the *Sabbath* was retained in the Churches planted by him [the apostle Paul], for he appoints that day to the Corinthians, whereon to collect their contributions in aid of their brethren in Jerusalem.'" (*Ibid.*)

We will now attend to what J. N. A. says, in the last quotation from him, where he says of the "Lord's day," that *Calvin* proposed to change the day from Sunday, to Thursday! etc. (p. 317.) The following from Gilfillan (p. 415) will answer this charge of J. N. A.:

"Although, then, particular expressions have been conceived to imply the contrary, the facts that have just been adduced prove that the *Reformers* considered the LORD'S DAY as belonging to a *very different* category from *holidays.* They reduced the number and altered the observance of holidays—in some instances, wholly excluded them—and if they had had their wish, would in every case have done so. In no instance was it ever attempted, or even proposed to them, to displace the Lord's day. The charge preferred by *Barclay against Calvin*, that 'he had a consultation once as to transferring the Lord's-day observances to Thursday,' had nothing to support it but the word of a man who lived in the Court of James I. as a spy in the interest of the Queen-Mother of France, and who, says

Dr. Twisse, 'if he could not prove true and loyal to his natural prince, could not be expected to carry himself truly and honestly toward John Calvin.' A charge which was not even attempted to be sustained by a particle of evidence, and yet still figures in anti-Sabbath works, merits no refutation, but we may state that it is disproved by the uniform respect for the day which Calvin expressed in his words and by his life."

Now for the real views of *Calvin*, in regard to the LORD'S DAY, as quoted by Gilfillan. And let the reader take particular notice, that he uses the terms "*Sabbath*" and "LORD'S DAY" as synonymous terms. On p. 407 he [Gilfillan] says:

"Thus Luther says, 'It is good and even necessary that men should keep a particular day in the week, on which they are to meditate, hear, and learn, for all cannot command every day; and nature also requires that one day in the week should be kept quiet, without labor either for man or beast.' (Quoted in Fairbairn's *Typol.* vol. II., p. 467.) On two occasions we find him utter his earnest desire for the abolition of holidays, and on both with the *express exception* of the '*dies Dominicus*' [LORD'S DAY]. (See p. 17 of this vol., *note* 4.) On the worth and absolute need of the weekly Sabbath, *Calvin* is still more explicit. It is as requisite now as it ever was: 'While the day has ceased as the figure of a spiritual and important mystery, there are other and different ends for which it is set apart; and in respect of the duty of resting from all earthly cares and employments, and applying to spiritual exercises in public and private, the necessity of a Sabbath is common to us with the people of old.' (*Comment.* on Exod. 20: 8–11.) The observance of it comprises in it all religion: 'Under the observance of the Sabbath is comprehended the sum of all piety.' (*Comment.* on Exod. 16: 28.) The neglect of it indicates the destitution and the contempt of Christian blessings: 'And hereby it

appears what affection we have toward all Christianity, and toward the serving of God, seeing we make that thing an occasion of withdrawing ourselves further off from God, which is given us as a help to bring us nearer unto him; and be we once gone astray, it serveth to pull us quite and clean away—and is not that a devilish spite of men?' (Ser. 34 on Deut. 5.) Such neglect not only is an act of indignity to religion, but renders every part of it ineffectual and valueless: 'He who setteth at nought the Sabbath-day, has cast under foot all God's service, as much as is in him; and if the Sabbath-day be not observed, all the rest shall be worth nothing.' (On Deut. 5, Ser. 34.) The observance of it, on the other hand, brings happiness to the individual, and secures protection to the State. 'The Sabbath, or rest of God—*le repos de Dieu*—is not idleness, but true perfection, which brings along with it a calm state of peace.' (On John 5: 17.) 'The city will be safe, if God be truly and devoutly worshiped, and this is attested by the sanctification of the Sabbath.'" (On Jer. 17.)

And again on p. 408 he continues:

"What a disciplinarian *Calvin* was, and how he labored by unwearied preaching and writing to enlighten and reform the Genevese, while on him 'came the care of all the Churches,' we need not say. But he has not received the credit due to him as a friend of the Sabbath. *Partial extracts* from his notices of the subject have been industriously circulated, while care has not been shown to set forth such passages as the following: 'It is for us to dedicate ourselves wholly to God, renouncing our feelings and all our affections; and then, since we have this external ordinance, to act as becomes us, that is, to *lay aside our earthly affairs*, so that we may be entirely free to meditate on the works of God.' (Ser. 34, Deut. 5.) 'The Sabbath is the bark of a spiritual substance, the use of which is still in force of denying ourselves, of renouncing all our own

thoughts and affections, and of *bidding farewell to one and all of our own employments*, so that God may reign in us, then of employing ourselves in the worship of God.' (*Ibid.*) 'Every man,' he remarks, as a reason why Christians should not go to law upon the LORD'S DAY, 'ought to *withdraw himself from everything but the consideration of God and his works*, that all men may be stirred up to serve and honor him.' (Ser. 93 on Deut. 5.) And as he excludes secular labor, so also worldly recreations; 'If we employ the LORD'S DAY to make good cheer, to sport ourselves, to go to games and pastimes, shall God in this be honored? Is it not a mockery? Is not this an unhallowing of his name?" (In Matt. 12: 11.)

Again he says, on p. 411:

"On this subject *Calvin* remarks, 'I am obliged to be a little more prolix here, because in our day some unquiet spirits make an outcry about the LORD'S DAY. They complain that the Christian people are nursed in Judaism because some observance of days is retained. (*Instit. on Fourth Commandment.*) 'When our shop windows,' he observes in another publication, 'are shut on the LORD'S DAY—when we travel not, after the common order and fashion of men—this is to the end we should have more liberty and leisure to attend on that which *God commandeth*, that is, to be taught by his word, to meet together, to make confession of our faith, to call upon his name, and to exercise ourselves in the use of his sacraments—the purpose which this order ought to serve.'" (Ser. 34, on Deut. 5.)

Will J. N. A.'s readers still believe that "*Calvin regarded the festival called the Lord's day* AS NOTHING BUT A HUMAN ORDINANCE!"

One point more, and we will take leave of J. N. A.'s so-called history. On p. 318 J. N. A. gives us a novel and ingeniously-constructed portion of *his* history (?), in the following language:

"Yet it is worthy of notice that at least *one* of the reformers of considerable prominence—Carlstadt—was a *Sabbatarian.* It is *impossible* to read the records of the reformation without the conviction that Carlstadt was desirous of a *more thorough work of reformation than was Luther.* And that while Luther was disposed to *tolerate certain abuses* lest the reformation should be endangered, Carlstadt was at *all hazards* for a complete return to the holy Scriptures. It is a matter of deep regret that a sharp contention separated these 'illustrious defenders' of the reformation, as D'Aubigne calls them, from each other. For it is evident that if Carlstadt was carried to one extreme, Luther was no less so to the other. D'Aubigne pronounces them both 'excellent' men, and says of Carlstadt:

"'He was a sound Latin, Greek, and Hebrew scholar, says Dr. Schoeur; and Luther acknowledges his superior erudition; endowed with an elevated mind, he sacrificed his reputation, his rank, his home, his very bread, to his convictions.'"

We will now call to the stand D'Aubigne, and permit him to testify to the *"whole truth."* But let it be remembered, that in the first place, J. N. A. has *perverted* this quotation from D'Aubigne, making Luther say *more than is true,* by placing a semicolon (;) where D'Aubigne placed a period (.). All that the true history says that Luther acknowledged in regard to Carlstadt, is this: "Luther acknowledged his superior erudition." But to make this plain, so there can be no mistake, we will give the extract as found in D'Aubigne; and then the reader can compare it with J. N. A.'s version of it. It reads:

"He was a sound Latin, Greek, and Hebrew scholar, says Dr. Schoeur; and Luther acknowledged his superior erudition. Endowed with an elevated mind, he sacrificed his reputation, his

rank, his home, his very bread, to his convictions." (*Hist. of Ref.* by H. White, B. A., vol. III., p. 198.)

In the above extract from J. N. A.'s comments, the reader will find that, according to *his* view of the matter, "Carlstadt was desirous of a more thorough work of reformation than was Luther." And that "Carlstadt was at all hazards for a complete return to the Holy Scriptures." But of Luther it is said, he "was disposed to tolerate certain abuses lest the reformation should be endangered." The following extracts from D'Aubigne's history will show how much truth there is in J. N. A.'s statements:

"Carlstadt's head in particular was turning in the midst of the general ferment. Zealous, upright, and bold, ready, like Luther, to sacrifice everything for the truth, he was INFERIOR to the *reformer* in *wisdom* and *moderation;* he was not entirely exempt from *vain-glory*, and with a disposition inclined to examine matters to the bottom, he was *defective in judgment and in clearness of ideas.* Luther had dragged him from the mire of scholasticism, and directed him to the study of the Scriptures; but Carlstadt had *not* acknowledged with his friend the *all-sufficiency of the Word of God.* Accordingly, he was often seen adopting the *most singular interpretations.* So long as Luther was at his *side*, the *superiority of the* MASTER *kept the* SCHOLAR *within due bounds.* But now Carlstadt was free. In the University, in the Church, everywhere in Wittemberg, this little, dark-featured man, who had never excelled in eloquence, might be heard proclaiming with great fervor ideas that were *sometimes* profound, but *often enthusiastic* and EXAGGERATED! 'What madness,' exclaimed he, 'to think that one must leave the Reformation to God's working alone. A new order of things is beginning. The *hand of* MAN SHOULD INTERFERE.

Woe be to him who lags behind, and does not climb the breach in the cause of the Almighty.' " (vol. III., p. 63.)

Again we read:

"Carlstadt rejected many of the doctrines of the new prophets, and particularly their sentiments on baptism; but there is a contagion in religious enthusiasm that a *head like his* could not easily resist. From the arrival of the men of Zwickau, in Wittemberg, Carlstadt accelerated his movements in the direction of *violent* reforms. 'WE MUST *fall upon every ungodly practice, and overthrow them all* IN A DAY,' said he." (p. 73.)

On p. 74 it is said:

'But Carlstadt soon went still farther: he began to *despise learning*," etc.

And again (p. 94) we read:

"It was not so at first with Carlstadt. Despising learning, pretending to frequent the workshops of the Wittemberg mechanics, to receive understanding of the Holy Scriptures, he was mortified at seeing his work *crumble away at Luther's appearance.* In his eyes this was checking the reform itself. Hence his air was always dejected, gloomy, and dissatisfied. Yet he sacrificed *his self-love* for the sake of peace; he restrained his desires of *vengeance*, and became reconciled, *outwardly* at least, with his colleague, and shortly after resumed his lectures in the University."

But once more (p. 193–4) we read:

"Carlstadt did not stop here. He was scarcely emancipated from *the guardianship of Luther*, before he felt his zeal revive against the images. It was easy for his *imprudent discourses* and his *enthusiastic language to inflame men's minds* in these agitated times. The *people imagining* they heard a *second*

Elijah, broke the idols of Baal. The excitement soon spread to the surrounding villages. The elector would have interfered; but the peasants replied, that they ought to obey God rather than man. Upon this, the *prince* determined to send *Luther* to Orlamund to *restore peace*. *Luther* regarded *Carlstadt* as a man *eaten up by a love of notoriety, a* FANATIC, *who might be so far* CARRIED AWAY AS TO MAKE WAR ON CHRIST HIMSELF!"

What shall we conclude from this description of "*one of the reformers!*" given by D'Aubigne? Was this "Carlstadt," introduced by J. N. A., a fair representative of "*a Sabbatarian*" in these days of "visions," and the "third angel's message!" From my acquaintance with some, I perceive quite a striking "family resemblance."

NECESSITY OF THE SABBATH.

To conclude, we will say that there is a *physical necessity* of a Sabbath. To express our view of this, we will give the following:

"Dr. Farr, one of the first physicians in this, or any other country, pledged (before a committee of the House of Commons) his professional character to the declaration, that the most extensive research he had been able to make into physical nature, had brought him to the conviction, that the Sabbath Law is stamped no less imperishably in the Decalogue, than it is on the constitution of man and beast; and that though, of course, no mere physical investigation could determine the precise amount, or the particular times and seasons, much less day, of suspension, there was wrought into the fabric and framework of organized life, a necessity for periodical suspension even of a healthful toil; and that the suspension actually ordained

by the Sabbath law, or its equivalent, could never, in the long run, be violated without present retribution."

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." (Is. 58: 13, 14.)

"Chafed and worn with worldly care,
Sweetly, Lord, my heart prepare;
Bid this inward tempest cease;
Jesus come and whisper peace!
Hush the whirlwind of my will;
With thyself my spirit fill;
End in calm this busy week—
Let the Sabbath gently break!

"Sever, Lord, these earthly ties—
Fain my soul to thee would rise;
Disentangle me from time—
Bear me to a purer clime:
Let me cast away my load,
Let me now draw near to God;
Gently, loving Jesus, speak—
End in calm this busy week."

INDEX.

PART I.—POSITIVE ARGUMENT.

Experience, 9, 28.
The seventh-day Sabbath a yoke of bondage, 10, 27.
The Sabbath a sign or type, 11–15.
Law of the Decalogue done away, 16–20, 84.
The apostles did not advocate the seventh-day Sabbath, 18, 47.
Christ's laws rest on laws outside of the Decalogue, 20, 34.
The law of faith, 21, 22.
The old law is dead, 23–26.
The old dead schoolmaster, 27, 63.
Paul's loss and gain, 28.
Mind the same thing, 29.
Christ the end of the old law, 30, 35.
A new commandment, 31.
Love is the fulfilling of the law, 32.
The perfect law of liberty. 33, 34.
Jots and tittles of the law must be fulfilled, 35.
Passover and Sabbath contrasted, 36–38, 64.
The Lord's day the Christian Sabbath, 39.
Lord's Supper—Lord's day, 39, 40.
Christ's new laws, 41–43.
The last seventh-day Sabbath, 44–47.
The seventh-day Sabbath not observed by the apostles, 47–49.
Old and new covenants, 50, 51.
Tables of stone kept in the ark, 52.
The high priest and mercy-seat, 53, 62.
Tables of stone destroyed, 54, 88, 121, 127.
New law written in the heart, 55, 62, 121.
Objection answered respecting the new covenant, 56, 57.
Old covenant imperfect, 58–60.

Old covenant written upon stone, the new upon the heart, 61, 62.
Live goat—seventh-day Sabbath, 63.
The passover, burnt offerings, seventh-week Sabbath, day of atonement, and seventh-day Sabbath, all of the same system, 64.
Christ demolished the whole system—a new and living way was then opened, 65–72.
Last time the word Sabbath is found in our version, 72.
The first day of the week observed by the early Christians, 73–76.
Objections answered respecting the Sabbath-day at the destruction of Jerusalem, third angel's message, 77.

MINISTRATION OF DEATH AND MINISTRATION OF THE SPIRIT.

Ministration—meaning of, 81.
Ministration of Death done away, 82–84.
Christianity wholly dependent upon the Spirit, 85–87.
The law for the first day Sabbath not written on stones, but on the heart, 88.
Influence of Judaism, 89.
State of the world when Christianity appeared, 89.
When the change took place from the seventh to the first day of the week, 90.
Christ's ministry restricted to the Jewish nation, 91.
Paul sometimes conformed to Jewish customs, 92.
Paul in the Jewish synagogues, 93–107.
The Sabbath mentioned in Acts 13: 42 is the first-day Sabbath, 98, 99.
A criticism on Paul's first day meeting at Troas, 106.
Day changed according to the law and the testimony, 107–139.
Before the patriarchs had any direct precept for keeping the Sabbath, 2,500 years had passed, 108, 119.
Christ a witness for the Sabbath, 109, 110.
The Holy Spirit a more important teacher than even Christ himself, 111, 112.
The apostles witnesses for the Sabbath, 113, 114.
The commandments of the Lord by the apostles, 115–117.
Why Paul met with the Jews on their Sabbaths, 118.
Why the term "first day of the week" does not occur in the Bible until after Christ's resurrection, 118.

The Sabbath as an institution was sanctified, not the particular day of the week, 118–9.
The Sabbath from the creation of the world to the birth of Christ, 119, 120.
The Sabbath consists of two parts, 121.
The work of redemption greater than creation, 122.
The first day commemorates both, 122.
The Sabbath as an institution not abrogated, but changed to another day, 123.
Change of days denoted by Psalms 118, 123–4.
Change of days also denoted by Matthew 9 : 14, 125–6.
The apostles did not kneel in prayer on the first day of the week, 126.
Moses breaking the tables of stone, indicative of a change of covenants, 127.
Hebrews 4 points to a change of days, 128–130.
Christ sanctified the first day, 131.
Change of days pointed out by the types of the wave-sheaf and wave-loaf, 132–135.
S. Bliss' views on the Sabbath, 136–138, 140–147.
London *Quarterly Journal of Prophecy* on the Sabbath, 147–149.

THE VOICE OF HISTORIANS.

Justin Martyr, 150–2.
Tertullian, 152.
Eusebius, 153.
Wm. Cave, 154–156.
Lord King, 157–160.
Peter Heylyn, 160–168.
Thos. Morer, 168–174.
Mosheim, 174–177.
Neander, 177.
Coleman, 178–184.

THE WALDENSES.

J. N. A. perverts the truth in regard to Sunday, 185.
Waldenses never had any connection with the Church of Rome, 187–8.
Meaning of Waldenses, 209.
Council of Nice, 188.
True Church of Christ always opposed the Papacy, 189–193.

The followers of Novatian continued until the Reformation, 190–192.
Cathari, or Puritans, 191, 204–7, 211–13, 216.
The Donatists, 192, 193.
What had the Emperor to do with the true Church, 193.
The Paulicians, 194–197, 211.
One hundred thousand Christians put to death, 197.
The valleys of Piedmont—how bounded, 197.
God's cabinet for choice jewels, 197.
Christians preserving the faith in its purity, 198.
Decrees of the second famous Council of Nice, 199
Claude, bishop of Turin, or God ordering events to preserve, in the worst of times, a seed to serve him, 199–202.
Claude's writings like Martin Luther's, 200–1.
Civil power against the Church, 203.
Infant baptism rejected, 204, 207.
The true Church found in all countries, 205.
Peter de Bruys preaching the Gospel, 206.
Petrobrucians and Henricians, 206, 211.
Paterines—meaning of—doctrine, and manner of life, 207–8.
Romanism condemned 500 years before the Reformation, 208.
Pope Sylvester condemned as anti-Christ, 208, 219, 221, 231.
The mark of the beast, 209.
Waldenses—why so called, 209.
Albigenses falsely charged with neglect of the Sabbath, and were called *Inzabbatati*, 210, 218.
Waldenses and Valdenses not different sects, 211–12.
Books of the Waldenses, 212.
Their enemies, Reinerius Saccho, &c., confirm their antiquity, 212–224.
Catharists and Waldenses held the same principles, 213.
The Vaudois, Leonists, and Peter Waldo, 213–14.
Rites and ceremonies of the Church of Rome condemned by Waldo, 214.
Leonists, Vaudois, Albigenses, and Waldenses designate the same class of Christians, 215, 220.
Persecuting edict issued from Rome A. D. 1181, 215–16.
Another edict from the king of Aragon A. D. 1194, 217.
Principles and practices of the Waldenses as set forth by their adversaries of the Romish Church, 218.
Reinerius Saccho once connected with the Waldenses, apostatized and entered the Romish Church, 218.
Saccho's charges against the Waldenses, 219, 220.
His testimony in their favor, 228.

Waldenses declare the Church of Rome to be the whore of Babylon, and all the clergy damned since the days of Pope Sylvester, 219.
Waldenses secretly worked upon Romish holy days, declaring old things laid aside, 220–22.
—— condemned the Romish Church as ungodly men, since the days of Pope Sylvester, 221.
—— contemned ecclesiastical customs, 222.
—— ceased from working upon no day except the Lord's day, 223, 231.
—— impossible to root them out, 223.
—— confessions of faith as given by themselves, 224, 226.
—— observed the Lord's day as the Sabbath, 227, 232.
Interesting document from Thuanus an eminent Catholic historian in favor of the Waldenses, 227.
Reinerius Saccho's testimony in their favor, 228.
A pastor of forty years' standing among them declares the Waldenses never mingled with the Church of Rome, 229.
Testimony of Milton respecting Waldenses and Pope Sylvester, 231.
Testimony of Jortin, 231.
Waldenses called the first day of the week—Sabbath, 232.

PART II.—REVIEW OF "BOTH SIDES."

Difference between the two sides, 237.
A chapter of quotations—U. Smith's "happy style," 238–242.
Smith's opinion of Preble, 242.
Misrepresentations of Preble answered, 243–249.
Novelty of washing feet, 249–251.
Noah Webster misrepresented, 254–6.
Greenfield misrepresented, 256–7.
Both Sides entangled in the Greek, 258–282.
J. Litch and S. Bliss misrepresented, 258–262.
Admission of *Both Sides* in regard to the Greek words *sabbaton* and *heemeran*, 262–265.
Prof. N. N. Whiting on the word *sabbath*, 265–7.
Denunciation of Prof. Whiting by U. Smith, 267.
Misrepresentations of the true import of the Greek words *sign* and *type*, 268–273.
Adam a type [*tupos*] of Christ, 272.

God declaring the end from the beginning by the type of *sevens*, 275–79.
Both Sides perverts the Greek in regard to the word *theleema*, &c., 280–82.
—— —— misrepresentations of the Scriptures, 282–309.
—— —— declares the New Testament not the law-book of mankind, 287.
—— —— declares there is no law in the New Testament to forbid the worship of graven images, 287.
—— —— *one minute* theory, 289–90.
—— —— attempts to show that Paul's meeting at Troas was on the second day of the week, 296–300.
—— —— misunderstanding of 1 Cor. 16: 2 corrected, 300–2.
—— —— denial that the first day of the week was ever sanctified, or set apart, for a day of worship, 302–4.
—— —— contradictions in regard to the two covenants, 304–7.
—— —— self contradictions, 307–12.
The law as a whole in New Testament, 312.
Contradictions on the relations of Christ to the Father, 312–15.
Christ not (?) a lawgiver, 315–16.
Contradictions as to the origin of the commandments, 316–17.
—— as to covenants, commandments, and the law, 317–27.
A catalogue of covenants, 328–38.
The Sabbath a command of works, 335.
Christ a covenant, 337.
The "law," of the Old Testament done away, 338–39.
The "moral law"—its relations to the ceremonial, 340–43.
The Book of the Law contained the Decalogue, 344–47.
Christ put out the old Jewish candle, 347–48.
The Decalogue a covenant, but not a mutual agreement, 349–51.
The new covenant—confusion and contradictions, 352–62.
Misrepresentations of the law, 362–69.
The seventh of Romans, 369–77.
Preble vs. Preble—Calvin better understood, 378–81.
A "noble sentiment," 382 83.
Both Sides' opinion of "the Fathers" and history, 384–86.

REVIEW OF J. N. ANDREWS.

The "review" not counselled, 387.
J. N. A.'s list of authors, 388–89.

—— dealing with their testimony, 389–91.
The "bogs and mire of error," 391.
Early apostasy in the Church, 391.
Mosheim and Neander, 392–95.
Attempt to impeach the Fathers, 395–97.
A cross-examination, 397–99.
Claims of the Epistle of Barnabas, 399–402.
Attempt to impeach Ignatius' testimony—the defence, 402–6.
A famous falsehood—"*Dominicum servasti?*" 406–12.
Origin of first-day observance, 412.
A garbled definition, 413–14.
Morer's testimony garbled, 414–17.
Coleman and Gilfillan, 417–19.
The edict of Constantine not given in behalf of the Christians, 419–21.
Important admissions, 421–22.
Constantine and Pope Sylvester—sophistry exposed, 423–28.
Tampering of the Papacy with prayer, 428.
—— with baptism, 428–30.
—— with the Lord's Supper, 430–32.
—— with marriage, 433–35.
—— with the seventh day, 433.
Days of the week named by the heathen, 435–36.
Labor on Sunday, 436–40.
The "dark ages" and Waldenses, 440–49.
J. N. A. on the Reformation, 449–51.
Alleged Anti-Sabbatism of the Reformers, 452–53.
The Augsburg Confession, 453–55.
Calvin defended from a false charge, 455–58.
Carlstadt—his true character, 459–62.
Necessity of the Sabbath, 462–63.
Conclusion, 463.

FEB 24 1886

FOR USE IN
BUILDING

~~SEP 12 '51 H~~

BOUND BY
Western Book Ma
Corner
Washington & Dea
CHICAGO